THE Lutheran Quarterly

me VIII MAY, 1956 Number 2

PACIFIC LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY THE LIBRARY

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Managing Editor
A. J. ENGELBRECHT
1250 Nowata St., Dubuque, Iowa

Book Editor
WARREN A. QUANBECK
2245 Luther Place, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

Circulation Manager
PAUL M. LINDBERG
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.

AUGSBURG SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

CENTRAL SEMINARY
FREMONT, NEB.

CHICAGO LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MAYWOOD, ILL.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SEMINARY OF CANADA
WATERLOO, ONT.

GRANDVIEW SEMINARY
DES MOINES, IOWA

HAMMA DIVINITY SCHOOL
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

LUTHERAN SEMINARY
SASKATOON, SASK.

NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

SOUTHERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
COLUMBIA, S. C.

SUOMI SEMINARY
HANCOCK, MICH.

TRINITY SEMINARY
BLAIR, NEB.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN SEMINARY
BERKELEY, CALIF.

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aim:* The aim of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume VIII MAY, 1956 Number 2

CONTENTS

HUMAN SUFFERING AND GOD'S SOVEREIGNTY ..... *Urpo Harva* 99

WORK AND THE CHRISTIAN CALLING ..... *George W. Forell* 105

GOD'S LONELY MEN ..... *Earl T. Knaus, Jr.* 119

WHAT DOES A SACRAMENT PROFFER? ..... *George Aus* 142

THE DIVINE SERVICE AS WITNESS AND CONFESSION ... *Martin J. Heinecken* 150

LIFE AND THOUGHT IN WORLD LUTHERANISM

U. S. A.: European Views of Lutheran Church Life in America; A New International Journal of Lutheran Theology ..... *Theodore G. Tappert* 165

The Yonan Codex ..... *J. M. Myers* 168

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Pelikan, ed., *Luther's Works*, XII (Theodore G. Tappert) 170

The Interpreter's Bible, III (H. Peder Waldum) 171

Lewy, *The Growth of the Pentateuch* (J. M. Myers) 172

Leivestad, *Christ the Conqueror* (David M. Granskou) 173

Hahn, *Old Testament in Modern Research* (C. Umhau Wolf) 174

Neil, *The Rediscovery of the Bible* (Olaf K. Storaasli) 175

Pelikan, *Fools For Christ* (Robert W. Larsen) 176

Kantonen, *The Christian Hope* (James H. Burtness) 176

Heick, *Guide to Christian Living* (James H. Burtness) 177

Long, *Conscience and Compromise* (Theo. I. Jensen) 179

Bienert, *Die Arbeit nach der Lehre der Bibel* (Otto W. Heick) 179

Hong, *This World and the Church* (G. F. Schott) 181

Flew and Davies, eds., *The Catholicity of Protestantism* (E. Clifford Nelson) 181

Fey, *The Lord's Supper* (G. Everett Arden) 182

Sherrill, *The Gift of Power* (C. Richard Evenson) 183

Shepherd, *At All Times and in All Places* (Edgar M. Carlson) 185

Kay, *The Nature of Christian Worship* (Edmund A. Steimle) 186

Messenger, *The Mediaeval Latin Hymn* (George R. Seltzer) 186

The Children's Hymnal (Gerhard M. Cartford) 187

The Choirmaster's Yearbook, IV (Gerhard M. Cartford) 188

Roberts, *The Grandeur and Misery of Man* (Sidney A. Rand) 188

Motter, ed., *Great Preaching Today* (John F. Rilling) 189

Jones, *On Being Your Best* (Harold L. Yochum) 190

Rogness, *Who Shall Be God* (Edmund A. Steimle) 191

Wedel and McCray, eds., *Go Preach* (Harry F. Baughman) 192

Lindemann, *Dead or Alive* (Henry H. Bagger) 192

CONTRIBUTORS

Urpo Harva is professor of Adult Education in the School of Social Sciences in Helsinki, Finland. His article was translated from the Finnish by Walter J. Kukkonen, pastor of Bethlehem Church, DeKalb, Illinois.

George W. Forell is associate professor in the School of Religion in the State University of Iowa.

Earl T. Knaus, Jr., is director of the Lutheran Student Foundation of Western Pennsylvania, with headquarters in Pittsburgh.

George Aus is professor of Systematic Theology in Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Martin J. Heinecken is professor of Systematic Theology in the Lutheran Seminary at Philadelphia.

Reporters on "Life and Thought in World Lutheranism" are Theodore G. Tappert and Jacob M. Myers, professor of Old Testament in the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

Among the reviewers in this issue are G. Everett Arden, professor of Church History in Augustana Theological Seminary; Henry H. Bagger, president of the Philadelphia Seminary; Harry F. Baughman, president of the Gettysburg Seminary; James H. Burtness, instructor in Theology, Luther Seminary, St. Paul; Edgar M. Carlson, president of Gustavus Adolphus College; Gerhard M. Cartford, instructor in Church Music in Luther Seminary, St. Paul; C. Richard Evenson, pastor of Wood Lake Church, Minneapolis; David M. Granskou, graduate student at Princeton Seminary; Otto W. Heick, professor of Systematic Theology, Waterloo Seminary; Theodore I. Jensen, dean of Trinity Seminary; Robert W. Larsen, Division of Student Service, National Lutheran Council; Jacob M. Myers, E. Clifford Nelson, professor of Church History in Luther Seminary, St. Paul; Sidney A. Rand, president of Waldorf College; John F. Rilling, pastor of St. John's Church, Minneapolis; George F. Schott, professor of Systematic Theology, Southern Seminary; Edmund A. Steimle, professor of Homiletics in the Philadelphia Seminary; Olaf K. Storaasli, president of Luther Seminary, Saskatoon; H. Peder Waldum, pastor in Rhame, North Dakota; C. Umhau Wolf, pastor of St. Paul's Church, Toledo; Harold L. Yochum, president of Capital University.

Human Suffering and God's Sovereignty

By Urpo Harva[1]

CAN modern man accept the sovereignty of God? Many today raise this question when confronted by the wholesale suffering that has engulfed humanity. One generation has gone through two world wars. Like violent storms these wars have sown destruction and death without any consideration whatsoever for the guilty or the innocent. How can God, who is good, permit such things if he is sovereign? We cannot doubt the goodness of God without denying his deity, for a wicked God is a devil and not God. But can we think of God without predicating absolute sovereignty of him? Is omnipotence an essential attribute of God?

Some have maintained that the doctrine of divine sovereignty is a carry-over from the Middle Ages and that modern man has made tremendous gains in the area of reason. The Middle Ages, too, knew much suffering, but people then were spiritually different. The rational requirement was not as important; so they saw no contradiction between the fact of suffering and the sovereignty of God. Man today, however, is keenly aware of this contradiction.

Is the concept of divine sovereignty at all a rational one? My answer would be an absolute no. The concept of the sovereignty of God is no hypothesis for the interpretation of world events. Reason can neither prove it nor disprove it. It falls entirely outside the realm of reason. The idea of an almighty God is to be distinguished *toto coelo* from such fabrications of reason as Spengler's theories of cultural philosophy and the theory of human progress. According to the basic notion of Spengler every culture, like a plant, is born, grows, and dies. Starting from certain demonstrable facts, Spengler develops this rational interpretation of phenomena of world history. By means of his hypothesis he attempts to explain empirical facts, yet his hypothesis is subject to the fate of every hypothesis: it can and it cannot be used to interpret facts. For example, if Western culture does not die, the

1 Translated from the author's Finnish manuscript by Walter J. Kukkonen.

fundamental concept of Spengler's philosophy of culture has proven false.

The same applies to the theory of progress. Prior to the world wars it was commonly believed that progress was inevitable. The two wars have demonstrated that the theory of progress was not in accord with world events. The loss of faith in continuous progress is therefore understandable.

The concept of the sovereignty of God has not arisen as a rational explanation of empirical facts, and so no observable universal phenomenon can destroy it. The idea of an almighty God does not stem from *reason*. It is a religious truth grounded solely in *faith*.

Modern man, therefore, if he views facts purely from the religious or Christian point of view and does not confuse reason and faith, need not doubt the sovereignty of God any more than medieval man. The seeming contradiction between the fact of suffering and the concept of divine sovereignty is basically, in the religious sense, no different today than yesterday. Our era has experienced untold suffering and witnessed events that cannot be explained, but all this is nothing new in world history. The introduction of Christianity itself was in a manner uniquely unfortunate and foolish. For Christianity began with this, that Christ, true God and true Man, yet without sin, came into the world to teach mankind "the way, the truth, and the life," and those to whom he came crucified him. To the Christian the sufferings and death of Christ are the most radical testimony to the terrible and irrational character of the course of this world. In all ages Christians have been aware that God *gave* his own Son to death and that Christ *voluntarily* bore the burden of suffering. To think that the Father and the Son were unable to prevent the death on the cross because they lacked absolute sovereignty would be to destroy the very foundation of Christian faith.

Modern times have undoubtedly seen more suffering than any other period in history if we think in terms of the number of human sufferers. But do statistics have any significance from the religious point of view? In other words, do we have more reason to doubt the sovereignty of God if millions suffer than if only a single individual suffers? Suppose all mankind were happy, except one lonely child whose terrible sufferings none could alleviate. Would not this give reason to doubt the sovereignty of God as much as the sufferings of many?

When we speak of the *omni*potence of God we mean absolute power, and even the least limitation means destruction of its absolute character. Suffering is in essence absolutely negative, and as such contrary to reason. Because of its absolutely negative character, it does not become more negative or more irrational when millions suffer rather than just one. And, in the final analysis, it is irrelevant whether the suffering is great or not. Though the sole sufferer were a small child and his suffering rather insignificant, the negative character would remain, the "black spot" would be there, and its existence would be a radical contradiction to the goodness and omnipotence of God, "in whom there is no darkness at all."

The problem of suffering is difficult to faith, regardless of the number of sufferers or the intensity of the suffering. One limitation, however, is clearly indicated by the Gospel. According to Christian faith suffering cannot be infinite. On the other hand, according to logic it is not impossible for suffering to be infinite; logically it can exceed the bounds of human capacity to bear and can destroy the self so that, as Kierkegaard said, man can no longer be "present to himself." We cannot demonstrate empirically that suffering cannot be infinite. As long as we are "present to ourselves," as long as we are able to bear the burden of suffering, we must say that our suffering is not infinite. But we can in no wise demonstrate that our suffering will not overpower us tomorrow.

What would infinite suffering mean? It would mean that existence would be the most terrible hell man can imagine; in fact, it would be worse than that, for if we can imagine the magnitude of suffering, we are still "present to ourselves," we have something in addition to suffering (namely, the light of reason) and so suffering has its bounds. If suffering is infinite, we cannot even conceive it but must "lose ourselves" and become irrational. Since we cannot demonstrate, logically or empirically, that suffering is not infinite, and since we can only live in a world in which suffering is not infinite, we are compelled to assume that there is something that puts a limit to suffering.

We may believe that "the world, after all, is not so bad," or that the world is essentially spirit, and that spirit is something positive. Nietzsche taught that we must acknowledge suffering as our fate in order that we might bear it. In that case, too, we assume that suffering is not more of a burden than we can accept as our fate. Succinctly, in

the words of Santayana, "that life is worth living is the most necessary of assumptions; and were it not assumed, it would be the most impossible of conclusions." Man may formulate various ideas as to the power that limits suffering so that life does not become absolutely negative. According to the Christian view, the limiting power is almighty God, who "will not place upon anyone a heavier burden than he can bear." If we maintain that God is helpless in the face of suffering, permitting it to become heavier than man can bear, we have destroyed the foundation of Christian faith.

Modern man need not, therefore, deny the sovereignty of God because reason sees a conflict between suffering and divine omnipotence. Suffering is an undeniable fact, and it is always contrary to reason. We can, of course, attempt to remove the contradiction between almighty God and suffering by denying the sovereignty of God, but even then the conflict between suffering and reason remains. But, as was pointed out, the concept of divine sovereignty is not a rational construction that must be constantly harmonized with experience. On the contrary, we cling to the conviction of an omnipotent God in order to stand under suffering. The sovereignty of God is not a rational, theoretical concept at all, but an axiological, practical concept, even as is divine goodness. Only the God who is "almighty" and "all-good" is as "he should be," the dynamic of life. Thus no horrors of the world can force compromise of this concept.

Some have argued that to conceive of the sovereignty of God as limited would be to the advantage of religious life. The doctrine of the sovereignty of God paves the way for human passivity. We expect God to do all things, and so we want to do nothing. Modern man is by nature an activist, and so he receives some satisfaction from the thought that he must come to the assistance of God. Surrender of the concept of divine sovereignty, it is said, would lead to a more wholesome religious life. So runs the argument. It must be pointed out, however, that emphasis upon human activity and its importance has always been an aspect of Christian faith. Paul says that "we are coworkers (*synergoi*) with God." In the German mysticism of the Middle Ages one of the primary motives was emphasis on the activity of man. Angelus Silesius, for example, says:

> *Gott, der die Welt gemacht und wieder kann vernichten,*
> *Kann nicht ohn meinen Willn die Neugeburt ausrichten.*

At the same time that he underscored the sovereignty of God, Kierkegaard did not define the relation of man to God as passivity but as radical activity: "There are then two powers: God and the world, good and evil; and the reason that man can serve only one master is no doubt that these two powers, even though one is infinitely greater than the other, are in conflict with one another, a conflict of life and death. The extreme danger in which man, being man, finds himself . . . the extreme danger that man is placed between these two infinite powers and that he has been given the power to choose . . . this extreme danger precisely makes it imperative to love or to hate. And love is not hatred; for such is the enmity between these two powers that the slightest leaning toward one means absolute contrariness when viewed from the vantage point of the other."

Kierkegaard is in line with an ancient Christian tradition. In spite of the fact that God is sovereign, that his power is infinitely greater than that of evil, man, who is but dust and ashes, must participate in this conflict with all his might lest the conflict result in the destruction of the good. The great mystic, Meister Eckhart, says that *wenn Gott auch allmächtig ist, so kann er doch nur wirken, so weit er Bereitschaft* [*in uns*] *vorfindet,* for *sein Walten ist ein anderes im Menschen als im Stein.* That almighty God cannot accomplish all things without man stems from the freedom of man. For this reason the Christian world-view is paradoxical. This paradox, however, is part of every world-view that does not deny human freedom. Immanuel Kant states that no philosopher, and he includes himself, has been able to comprehend freedom.

Human life and activity can be meaningful only if we believe that existence is not negative, that is, that suffering is not infinite and that evil and wickedness cannot have the final word but that some power limits suffering and finally brings the good and the right to complete victory. Human reason cannot define this power. It may be a universal spirit, nature or a moral world order, or perhaps death which ultimately receives every sufferer into its bosom; or eternal life, which in the end engulfs death; or yet perhaps light, which dispels all darkness. The theories that philosophers have constructed are many.

For nearly two thousand years Christians have believed that the power is almighty God. Why suffering has not been removed and why, on the contrary, the conflict has been permitted to continue, we do not

know. This we know, however, that none can avoid participation, on one side or the other, in this most terrible of universal conflicts, for we are all free personalities. We know, too, that the problem of suffering is beyond our ability to solve, for we are but men. We cannot will to bear suffering, for then it would no longer be suffering. We are under the law of suffering in an absolute sense. If we are good, we cannot will that another should suffer. We are subject to the law of goodness also in an absolute sense. Thus we would remove all suffering from the world if we could, but because there continues to be suffering, we know that we cannot remove it. Our being compels us to exert all our might against suffering to overcome it, but we know that is not sufficient. Similarly, each being, like unto us in its relation to suffering and goodness, ought to put forth its best in like manner toward the extinction of suffering. That suffering remains nevertheless is a sure sign that the combined effort of all beings like unto us is inadequate to the problem of suffering. Since we must, however, believe that there is a Power able to cope with suffering, we must conclude that this Power has not merely a thousand times more power than we have, but *all power*. For even an infinitely greater power than we might not be able to overcome evil. Yet we concluded above that every being like unto us is under the absolute law which states that it must will the destruction of suffering. That suffering remains means that there cannot be a creature that has all power, unless that creature is different from us, so absolutely sovereign that, itself free from the law of suffering, it can voluntarily "bear all our suffering," as the Word says, and, itself free from the law of goodness, can permit us to bear suffering without doing an injustice toward us, so that, on the contrary, we can, like Kierkegaard, find "something uplifting in the thought that we are always in the wrong over against God." In other words, if there is a sovereign Being, he must be different from man. He must be God, for, as Meister Eckhart says, *Das ist Gottes Art und Natur: Ohnegleichen zu sein, niemandem gleichen.* Were God like man, he would remove suffering. But suffering remains, and precisely from this we know that if there is God, he must be almighty; he can permit suffering to remain, regardless of how incomprehensible it may be to human reason.

Work and the Christian Calling

By George W. Forell

THE attitude of modern man toward work is characterized by a peculiar ambiguity. We love and hate work at the same time. We cannot get along without it, and to be involuntarily or even voluntarily unemployed has consequences which damage the very center of our personality. Yet we are always "over-worked," in need of rest, and looking forward to a vacation or to retirement. Bishop Cumberland puts it like this:

> This is the gospel of labour, ring it ye bells of the kirk:
> The Lord of love came down from above, to live with the men who work.
> This is the rose that He planted here in the thorn-curst soil;
> Heaven is blest with perfect rest, but the blessing of earth is toil.

And yet Thomas Hood's description of the sweatshop will also move us when he deplores the curse of work in the *Song of the Shirt,*

> O men with sister dear! O men with mother and wives!
> It is not linen you're wearing out, but human creatures' lives.

And Charles Lamb asks in a mood very familiar to us, "Who first invented work and bound the free and holiday-rejoicing spirit down . . . to that dry drudgery at desk's dead wood?" It would not be too difficult to trace the ambivalent attitude toward work through all our literature. Put very simply, two contradictory attitudes toward work are firmly rooted in our minds:

I. Work is an evil, at best a necessary evil!
II. Work is the activity which gives life meaning and zest; it is our purpose in life!

The one will say we must work in order to live, the other will insist we live in order to work. Most of us will say both, at one time or another, depending on our mood.

It is the claim of this presentation that from the point of view of Scripture and the faith of the church both positions are dangerous and

tend to pervert our relationship to God. Furthermore, the two great branches of Western Christendom, Roman Christians and Evangelical Christians, are threatened by different aspects of the perversion of the Christian understanding of work. Rome tends to see in work an evil, at best a necessary evil. Wittenberg and Geneva tend to see in work an end in itself, even an absolute good.

As is the case in so many other instances, the Roman attitude toward work is greatly influenced by Greek thought in general and by Aristotle in particular. In the seventh book of his *Politics* Aristotle says: "There can be no doubt that children should be taught those useful things which are really necessary, but not all useful things, for occupations are divided into liberal and illiberal, and to young children should be imparted only such kinds of knowledge as will be useful to them without vulgarizing them. And any occupation, art, or science, which makes the body or soul or mind of the freeman less fit for the practice or exercise of virtue, is vulgar; wherefore we call those arts vulgar which tend to deform the body, and likewise all paid employments, for they absorb and degrade the mind."[1] And a little later he continues, "The object also which a man sets before him makes a great difference; if he does or learns anything for his own sake or for the sake of his friends, or with a view to excellence, that action will not appear illiberal; but if done for the sake of others, the very same action will be thought menial and servile."[2]

Aristotle insisted that it was demoralizing and degrading to work with one's hands and to work for pay. In his opinion the work of a craftsman or mechanic, not to mention the work of a common laborer, would make a man inferior.[3] This attitude was eventually transferred in a somewhat modified form to the Christian theologians of the West. In the Middle Ages most writers expressed similar sentiments. For example, Bernard of Clairvaux classified people on a scale of ascending perfection. On the lowest level were the people in the "world," the "active" were on a somewhat higher plane, but on the highest rung of this ladder were the "contemplative." He said, "Of these three classes some are within the mill, others are out in the fields, and the third class are resting on the bed. The mill is the secular life, the field

1 *The Works of Aristotle*, ed. Ross (Oxford, 1921), X, 1337 b.
2 *Loc. cit.*
3 *Ibid.*, 1277a, 1277b.

is the soul of the person living in the world. The preachers of the Word of God are in this field. But on the bed rests the sacred love of the spouse of Christ."[4] With this classification Bernard described the lay folk, the secular clergy, and the monastic orders. He said plainly, "Happier and more perfect than the active life is the contemplative."[5]

A similar position was taken by the man who eventually became the official theologian of the Roman Church, Thomas Aquinas. In the second part of his *Summa Theologica* he quotes with approval the following statement of Gregory: "Great are the merits of the active life, but greater still those of the contemplative." And he comments, "The love of God is by itself more meritorious than the love of our neighbor. Wherefore that which pertains more directly to the love of God is generically more meritorious than that which pertains directly to the love of our neighbor for God's sake. Now, the contemplative life pertains directly and immediately to the love of God; for Augustine says that the love of the divine truth seeks a holy leisure, namely of the contemplative life, for it is that truth above all which the contemplative life seeks. On the other hand, the active life is more directly concerned with the love of the neighbor, because it is busy about much serving (Luke 10:40). Wherefore the contemplative life is generically of greater merit than the active life."[6] Later he continues in the same mood. "This is moreover asserted by Gregory, 'The contemplative life surpasses in merit the active life, because the latter labors under the stress of present work' by reason of the necessity of assisting our neighbor, 'while the former with heartfelt relish has a foretaste of the coming rest,' i.e., the contemplation of God."[7]

When the medieval theologians attribute value to the active life, as they frequently do, it is not because they believe it has any intrinsic worth but because the active life can contribute to discipline. Thomas Aquinas states this position as follows: "The work of the active life conduces to the contemplative by quelling the interior passions which give rise to the phantasms whereby contemplation is hindered."[8]

4 S. Bernardi, *Opera Omnia*, ed. Migne, Paris, 1879, Vol. 184, p. 1276 (De modo bene vivendi, sermo 53). See also Heinrich von Eicken, *Geschichte und System der mittelalterlichen Weltanschauung* (Stuttgart, 1887), pp. 488 ff.

5 S. Bernardi, *op. cit.*, p. 1277.

6 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, tr. by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province, 22 vols. (London, 1920), Vol. 14, pp. 136 ff.

7 *Ibid.*, p. 136.

8 *Ibid.*, p. 139.

In itself the religious value of work is small. Only as a means to the end of contemplation does it receive meaning. It is generally assumed that work is the result of the Fall and a necessary evil at best.

This devaluation of work which characterizes Roman Catholicism is also observable in the relative lack of appreciation for the various jobs and professions which men must use to earn a living. As Max Weber has pointed out, "Thomas Aquinas thought of activity in the world as a thing of the flesh, even though willed by God. It is the indispensable natural condition of a life of faith, but in itself, like eating and drinking, morally neutral."[9] Only the religious life was ethically valuable; therefore all non-religious activities, though necessary, were ethically inferior. We are in them because God in his providence established these various professions in order to preserve the human race and because different individuals chance to have different inclinations. Even so evangelical a Roman Catholic as Blaise Pascal can say, "The most important affair in life is the choice of a calling; chance decides it. Custom makes men masons, soldiers, slaters."[10]

This depreciation of work has characterized civilization wherever Roman Catholicism has been the dominating spiritual force. The glorification of contemplation degenerated in many instances into the glorification of idleness, and the analysts of economic history have shown that the peculiar economic stagnation that has characterized many Roman Catholic countries, even in our own times, is not unrelated to the prevailing understanding of work. If economic work is understood at best as a necessary evil, at worst as an activity of the body which prevents the proper cultivation of the soul, such work will not find many dedicated devotees. If only the *homo religiosus* find ethical and social approval, the *homo economicus* will not develop to the fullest.

Roman Catholicism clearly recognizes the dangers of economic life, life in this world. However, its counsel to men who are confronted by the temptations of economic life is escape from the world into the monastery. Aware of the temptations and dangers of the active life in the world, which is the lot of most human occupations, Roman Catholicism advises men to desert the confusion of the world and to find refuge in the monastery. And there is something universally ap-

9 Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York, 1930), p. 80.
10 Blaise Pascal, *Pensees*, Everyman's Library (New York, 1948), p. 29.

pealing about this suggestion. Modern man, aware of the moral ambiguities of his daily economic existence, welcomes the opportunity to escape. This is the charm of Thomas Merton's *Seven Storey Mountain.* It is undeniably true that not only Roman Catholics try to solve the problem of modern economic man by an escape into the monastery. There are similar ideas increasingly popular among Protestants as well. When we speak loosely of "full-time Christian service" and mean only the ministry or the diaconate, we are following the same pattern. The attitude of many ex-soldiers during and after the war in choosing the ministry had its roots, at least partially, in an understanding of the ministry as the office of the *homo religiosus* who escapes the trials and temptations of *homo economicus.* And the same spirit can still be found among many college students, not to mention Luther Leaguers and participants in Bible Camps. Here the Roman concept runs rampant. The ordinary work of the butcher, the baker, the farmer, the welder is considered secular and inferior, while the only "full-time Christian service" seems to be the work of the minister and the missionary, the parish-worker and the deaconess.

Among Protestants and Roman Catholics the problem created by the complexities of modern economic life have led many to think in terms of institutional salvation. We believe, and we encourage the belief in others, that there are certain professions, especially the ministry, which bring us, in some unique way, closer to God. Ordinary work is somehow evil, or at least ethically neutral; however, "full-time Christian service," i.e., work in the employ of the church as an institution, is by itself holy and good.

But this is only one aspect of the problem. Much more common among Protestants in general, and historically deeply rooted in Protestant thought, is the belief that work in itself is service to God. We find here the position that faithfulness in our job saves us, that the life of Christian discipleship is achieved when we are good shoemakers, good butchers, good teachers, good welders, good pastors, and last, but by no means least, good bankers.

The identification of Christian life with the socially accepted virtues of the bourgeois society to which we belong is the great danger which threatens the Protestant insistence that work is the activity which gives life meaning and zest, that we live in order to work.

The roots of this changed attitude toward work among Protestants

are clearly found in the Reformation movement itself. It was Luther who had emphasized that God's command to man to "subdue the earth and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth" (Gen. 1:28) precedes the Fall of man. Work is therefore a divine order of creation, part of the arrangement of Paradise, and not merely a means of discipline and a necessary evil. It is God's will that man should work. Though as a result of sin work is subject to perversion and afflicted with sorrow, sweat, and pain, this is not an essential and original attribute of work but the result of the corruption of nature through man's fall from grace.[11]

Luther translated the famous sentence in I Cor. 7:20, *Ein jeglicher bleibe in dem Beruf darinnen er berufen ist.* The King James Version translates: "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called." And ARSV flattens it into: "Every one should remain in the state in which he was called." As Max Weber has brilliantly pointed out, the broad and comprehensive understanding of the Greek work *klesis* as *Beruf,* calling, or vocation, which is characteristic for Luther and for all languages which have received their present form under the influence of the Reformation, contributed to a completely different understanding of work from that which had characterized pagan antiquity and the Middle Ages.[12]

As Luther saw it, God confronts man in his daily work and calls him to responsible discipleship right here. Man does not find God by escaping from the world into the ghetto of religious life. There is no monastery or convent where God dwells. All human efforts to attain God by fleeing this world will always be frustrated. But out of his grace and mercy God confronts us in our daily occupation, in our calling. Wherever man is, there God reaches him and calls him to discipleship. Luther does not make an ethical value differentiation between the various callings. Man can serve God in any of them.

What matters is not the kind of work you do, the kind of office you hold, but that you do your work and hold your office responsibly. God calls; man must respond. And he responds by serving God where God has placed him, be it as a student or as a servant-girl, a mother or a craftsman, a pastor or a prince.

11 *W.A.,* 42:78, 26 ff. (Commentary on Genesis, 1535-45.)
12 Max Weber, *op. cit.,* pp. 79 ff.

Luther insisted that man must not needlessly leave the "calling" where God has called him. It is not our task to find a "Christian" calling but to hear Christ's call and thus to make our job into a Christian calling. Luther said: "All classes (*stände*) and all the works of God are to be praised as highly as ever they can be, and none of them is to be despised in favor of another, for it is written, *Confessio et magnificentia opus ejus,* 'What God does is fair and fine'; and again in Psalm 104, 'God is well pleased with his works.' Especially ought preachers to impress these ideas upon the people from their youth up, school teachers ought to impress them on the boys and parents on their children, so that they may well learn what classes and offices are God's and ordained of God. If they know this, so that they despise and mock at and speak evil of none of them, but hold them all in honor, that pleases God and serves the cause of peace and unity; for God is a great lord and has many kinds of servants."[13]

But although Luther did not want people to try to find their calling by leaving their present responsibilities and going into the monastery, he was not so conservative as this might indicate and as some of his interpreters have claimed. When encouraging parents to send their children to school he insisted that these children should have the opportunity for all sorts of important callings. He suggested that they might become pastors and school-teachers, that they might become jurists and counselors to princes and rulers. And he said significantly, "There is need in this office [of government service] of abler people than are needed in the office of preaching, so that it is necessary to keep the best boy for this work, for in the preaching office Christ does the whole thing by his spirit, but in worldly government one must use reason—from which the laws have to come—for God has subjected temporal rule and bodily things to reason (Genesis 2) and has not sent the Holy Spirit from heaven for this purpose. Therefore, governing is harder because it cannot be ruling over things that are certain and must act, so to speak, in the dark."[14]

But Luther asserts openly that the children of the common folk will eventually fill all the important callings. He says that it is typical for God "to take beggars and make them lords, just as he makes all

13 *W.A.*, 30: 517 ff. (A Sermon on Keeping Children in School). Cf. Philadelphia ed., IV, p. 168.
14 *Ibid.*

things out of nothing. . . . It is not God's will that born kings, princes, lords, and nobles should rule and be lords alone; he wills to have his beggars with them, so that they may not think that noble birth alone, and not God alone, makes lords and rulers."[15] "Therefore, have your son study, and do not hesitate about it, and even if he has to go after his bread meanwhile, you are giving our Lord God a fine bit of wood out of which he can carve you a lord. It must continue to be a fact that your son and my son—that is, the sons of common folk—must rule the world both in the spiritual and worldly ranks, as this Psalm [113] testifies. For the rich misers cannot and will not do it; they are the Carthusians and monks of Mammon and they must serve him day and night. The born princes and lords cannot do it alone, and especially they cannot understand anything at all about the spiritual office. Thus both kinds of government on earth must remain with the middle class and the common people and their children."[16]

These quotations should indicate that Luther does not have a static-aristocratic concept of the calling. But he does not have a bourgeois-Protestant concept either. Nowhere does Luther say that we fulfill our Christian duty and respond to God's call if we merely do our job.[17] The Word of God and faith make the works of our calling acceptable before God; without the Word of God and without faith these works serve the devil and lead to death.[18] Our work is God's mask which he uses to bless and to give us what is in fact his own. And if God did not create everything through his Word, all our work and effort would be in vain.[19] Indeed, God prohibits the obsession that makes us think, The more I work the more I shall have.[20]

As K. Eger has pointed out in his *Die Anschauung Luthers vom Beruf*,[21] the Christian according to Luther serves God *in vocatione* not *per vocationem*. Our calling is the place where we can and must serve God. But the service of God and the neighbor, or perhaps better, the service of God in the neighbor, is our calling.

As the detailed studies of Max Weber and R. H. Tawney have

15 *Ibid.*
16 *Ibid.*
17 *W.A.*, 37: 476, 23 ff. (Sermon, July 5, 1534).
18 *Ibid.*
19 *W.A.*, 31: 446, 9 ff. (Exposition of Psalm 147, 1532).
20 *W.A.*, 32: 72, 10 ff. (Sermon of April 20, 1530).
21 Karl Eger, *Die Anschauung Luthers von Beruf* (Giessen, 1900); see also Gustaf Wingren, *Luthers Lehre vom Beruf* (München, 1952).

pointed out, this attitude of Luther, that the calling is the place where the Christian can serve God, was gradually transformed by Calvinism and Puritanism. For the Puritans, success in one's calling became a Christian duty. Baxter in his *Christian Directory* (1678) said, "If God show you a way in which you may lawfully get more than in another way (without wrong to your soul or to any other), if you refuse this and choose the less gainful way, you cross one of the ends of your calling, and you refuse to be God's steward."[22]

How one can make the job itself into the discipleship that God demands, the purpose of man's life, was explained by a number of fascinating books written by Puritan theologians. A few, quoted from Tawney, may suffice as illustrations. *Navigation Spiritualized: or a New Compass for Seamen, consisting of 32 points* (1682), or *Husbandry Spiritualized, or the Heavenly Use of Earthly Things* (1682). Another tract is entitled, *The Religious Weaver,* another *The Tradesman's Calling.* The latter is aptly summarized in this quotation, "Prudence and Piety were always very good friends. . . . You may gain enough of both worlds if you would mind each in its place.[23] Tawney describes this development very aptly.

> In their emphasis on the moral duty of untiring activity, on work as an end in itself, on the evils of luxury and extravagance, on foresight and thrift, on moderation and self-discipline and rational calculation, they had created an ideal of Christian conduct which canonized as an ethical principle the efficiency which economic theorists were preaching as a specific for social disorders. It was as captivating as it was novel. To countless generations of religious thinkers, the fundamental maxim of Christian social ethics had seemed to be expressed in the words of St. Paul to Timothy: "Having food and raiment, let us be therewith content. For the love of money is the root of all evil." Now, while as always the world battered at the gate, a new standard was raised within the citadel by its own defenders. The garrison had discovered that the invading host of economic appetites was not an enemy, but an ally. Not sufficiency to the needs of daily life, but limitless increase and expansion became the goal of the Christian effort. . . . The shrewd, calculating commercialism which tries all human relations by pecuniary standards, the acquisitiveness which cannot rest while there are competitors to be conquered or profits to be won, the love of social power and hunger for economic gain—these irrepressible appetites had evoked from time immemorial the warnings and denunciations of saints and sages. Plunged in the cleansing waters of later Puritanism, the qualities which less enlightened ages had denounced as social vices

22 R. H. Tawney, *Religion and The Rise of Capitalism* (New York, 1926), p. 243.
23 *Ibid.,* p. 244.

emerged as economic virtues. They emerged as moral virtues as well. For the world exists not to be enjoyed but to be conquered. Only its conquerer deserves the name of Christian. For such a philosophy, the question, "What shall it profit a man?" carries no sting. In winning the world, he wins the salvation of his own soul as well.[24]

Weber and Tawney have described the significance of this changed attitude for the economic development of the West and the rise of Capitalism. As far as an understanding of the calling is concerned, it meant that the criterion was ever less discipleship and increasingly success and financial achievement. Soon God's blessing and success in our work were identified. The rich are the good; the poor are the wicked. As a Puritan pamphleteer put it in 1654, "Riches should be the portion rather of the godly than of the wicked, were it good for them: for godliness hath the promises of this life as well as the life to come."[25]

Arthur Young wrote in 1771, "Every one but an idiot knows that the lower classes must be kept poor, or they will never be industrious."[26] Success in our calling is a proof of merit, a sign of God's approval. In this form has the evangelical acceptance of God's calling been interpreted in modern times. Eventually the notion of a Christian God was considered no longer necessary, and success and wealth itself became objects of worship. The Physiocrats and Utilitarians demonstrated that God has given economic laws, pre-eminently the law of supply and demand, which govern in the economic realm, just as he has given natural laws, e.g., the law of gravitation, to govern the planets in their courses. A free market and absolute respect for the absolute right of property and the divine law of supply and demand are the way to prosperity and justice. The New Testament should and could no more interfere with the laws of the market-place than with the laws of planetary motion. Our calling, our business, is in one realm of life, where its own autonomous rules govern. Our faith is in another realm of life, where the New Testament insights must prevail. But, said modern man, these two realms must not be confused. Religion is religion and business is business. In our calling we must be faithful, not to Christ but to the divine law of economics.

This is the situation as it confronts us today. The Protestant

24 *Ibid.*, p. 247.
25 *Ibid.*, p. 267 (R. Younge, *The Poores' Advocate*, 1654, Thomason Tracts, E. 1452,3), p. 6.
26 *Ibid.*, p. 270; see Arthur Young, *Eastern Tour*, 1771, IV, p. 361.

interpretation of work is dominated by two almost contradictory sentiments. The one group claims that success in our work is itself a sign of divine approval. As Kierkegaard observed with horror, it appears that the mere fact that a man becomes a bishop is in and of itself considered evidence that he is a "witness to the truth." In his *Attack Upon Christendom* Kierkegaard bitingly ridiculed this comfortable identification of success and discipleship. He said: "In the magnificent cathedral the Honorable and Right Reverend Geheime General Ober Hofpraedikant, the elect favorite of the fashionable world, appears before an elect company and preaches with emotion upon the text he himself elected: 'God hath elected the base things of the world, and the things that are despised'—and nobody laughs!"[27] And later he wrote: "Had the Apostle Paul any official position? No, Paul had no official position. Did he then earn much money in other ways? No, he didn't earn money in any way. Was he at least married? No, he was not married. But then, really, Paul is not a serious man. No, Paul is not a serious man."[28]

Kierkegaard's attack appears justified. In the light of the modern Protestant interpretation of the calling Paul was not a success in his calling at all. And most Christian saints and sages proved through their obvious lack of success that they did not fully understand what we have learned so well, that we are pleasing to God if we receive applause, wealth, and power in whatever we do.

One of the most popular radio-preachers in America, who is sponsored by the National Council of Churches, the official agency of the majority of Protestant Christians in America, fills the air Sunday after Sunday with this gospel of success. Become a Christian and you will be a success—you will have a good job, a beautiful and faithful wife, intelligent children, and you will live to a ripe old age. And by politicians and preachers, before service-clubs and at cocktail parties, Christianity and enlightened self-interest are glibly identified. Be a Christian, they all shout, for it pays to be a Christian. Try Jesus; he satisfies!

Catholicism tended to depreciate work. It could not find a truly positive relationship between economic labor and our responsibility to God. Monasticism saw the tension between the fallen world and the Christian. It attempted to find a place where this tension does not exist.

27 *Kierkegaard's Attack Upon Christendom, 1854-1855* (Princeton, 1944), p. 181.
28 *Ibid.*

It tried to escape from work and the world into contemplation and the cloister. Protestantism has tended to glorify work and our responsibility to God. It seems insensitive to the fact that work, like any other human activity, can become demonic, obsessive, and separate us from God. Seeing in work an end in itself, this secularized Protestantism (*Kultur-Protestantismus*) fails to sense the tension between self-fulfillment and Christian discipleship. Work and the success it brings is not an end; it is at best a means. It is simply not enough to work hard and to do the best we can in our profession. We are not saved by good citizenship or responsibility in our daily work. We are called to responsibility to God in our work; we are saved by grace through faith in Jesus Christ.

If the analysis of the problem of the Christian calling here presented is at all valid, a number of warnings, which ought to be implemented in the preaching of the church, seem in order.

An evangelical understanding of the Christian calling does not permit the use of the concept of calling as an escape from the hard, cruel world. Monasticism in all its forms, even its Lutheran forms, must be revealed for what it is: escape from Christian responsibility. God calls us in our work. We must not leave our work because it is hard or because it involves temptations. There is no geographical escape from temptation. The early Christian hermits who tried to flee temptation found that in the wilderness and the desert temptation had followed them.

We are constantly reminded that the ministry is as subject to temptation, is as involved in sin, as any other calling. There is no place in this world where we are free from temptation. We might as well follow the Apostle's advice wherever God calls us: "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong" (I Cor. 16:13).

Furthermore, an evangelical understanding of the Christian calling cannot worship worldly success. Lust for power, ambition, the will to dominate others, must not be camouflaged by a concept of the calling which sees in success an end in itself. The worship of the self-made man has no room in a church which believes that we are God-made men. And we should learn from Simone Weil that, as she says, "The extreme greatness of Christianity lies in the fact that it does not seek a supernatural remedy for suffering, but a supernatural use for it."[29]

29 Simone Weil, *Gravity and Grace* (New York, 1952), p. 132.

We know that the success of a man in his calling cannot be measured in the terms which the world uses, for in those terms the Cross is the greatest debacle in the history of mankind. Humanly speaking the Cross is powerlessness, the failure of a mission—catastrophe and collapse! Only if we see life as calling, as discipleship, can we see, again in the words of Simone Weil, that " 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' is the real proof that Christianity is something divine."[30]

Neither by escaping the world into the desert, nor by accepting the world and its standards of value, did our divine Saviour fulfill his calling, but by faithfulness and obedience unto death, even the death on the Cross. It is in these terms that our calling must be evaluated. And here, in spite of the excesses of his attack, Soren Kierkegaard should be required reading for Christians in general and Christian pastors in particular. For when the church begins to measure ultimate success and failure in a man's calling by the statistics and standards of the world, it has in fact abandoned Christianity.

Finally, there is no room for the concept of absolute autonomy within the framework of the evangelical understanding of the Christian calling. We cannot and must not grant that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is irrelevant to the affairs of this world. The idea that business, politics, education, and labor are territories which are ruled by their own laws and that Christian insights are limited to our personal devotional life is a denial of the First Commandment and of the lordship of Christ.

This does not mean that the church as an ecclesiastical institution has detailed blue-prints for "Christian business," "Christian politics," "Christian labor relations," or even "Christian education" which are valid for all times. But it does mean that the Christian answers his call from God in business, in politics, in education, at the assembly-line, in the hospital, and in the home. He cannot work merely for profit, but he must work for God and neighbor. He cannot work merely for the sake of achieving leisure, but again he must serve God and neighbor. He cannot be interested merely in being employed, but he must be concerned with the quality and character of his work—again for the sake of God and neighbor.

To the Christian no activity is secular because all his life is service to God. What this means in each individual job must be worked out by

30 *Ibid.*, p. 139.

responsible Christians familiar with all aspects of the job. It cannot be laid down as a law from the outside. But the clue to the Christian understanding of work is the knowledge that it is neither an evil, at best a necessary evil, nor is it the activity which of itself gives life meaning and zest, our purpose in life. But it is a means that God has given us to serve him and our neighbor and to show our faith active in love.

God's Lonely Men[1]

By Earl T. Knaus, Jr.

THE LONELY man in literature is known to all. Indeed, the same could be said of life itself. These men have much in common with one another, especially in literature. This might well be due to the fact that they are largely descendants of that strange and fascinating Old Testament character, Job. Certainly the lonely men of literature are almost invariably akin to the literary progeny of Job. Some of these men, as seen through the eyes of four different authors in English and American literature, have a special interest for us.

I

Thomas Wolfe[2] whose work is almost haunted by the figure of the lonely man (Wolfe himself) has an essay entitled "God's Lonely Man."[3] "My life, more than that of anyone I know, has been spent in solitude and wandering,"[4] wrote Wolfe.

> I propose, therefore, to describe the experience of human loneliness exactly as I have known it. The reason that impels me to do this is not that I think my knowledge of loneliness different in kind from that of other men. Quite the contrary. The whole conviction of my life now rests upon the belief that loneliness, far from being a rare and curious phenomenon, . . . is the central and inevitable fact of human existence. When we examine the . . . grief and ecstasy of the greatest poets, but also the huge unhappiness of the average soul, . . . we find, I think, that . . . the final cause of their complaint is loneliness.[5]

Wolfe tries to explain, and impressively enough, what this experience

1 Perhaps a helpful subtitle would be: "A Study of Ideas in Literature, Showing the Influence of Parallel Biblical Ideas, and Using Theological Insights for Clarification."

2 Thomas Wolfe (1900-1938), one of twentieth century America's most gifted writers, was born and raised in our Southern states. He always wanted to be a writer, and his book *Look Homeward, Angel* (1929) brought him instant recognition. He was a close observer of nature and human personality, and much of his work is autobiographical and is known for its somewhat repetitious and verbose, but beautiful and compelling style.

3 Thomas Wolfe, *The Hills Beyond* (New York, 1941).

4 *Ibid.*, p. 186.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 186.

of loneliness is. "There are times when anything, everything, all or nothing, the most trivial incidents, the most casual words, can in an instant strip me of my armor, palsy my hand, constrict my heart with frozen horror, and fill my bowels with the gray substance of shuddering impotence."[6]

In his attempt to define the experience of the lonely man, Wolfe elaborates in a concrete manner, with many figures of speech, and concludes in one place:

> All this hideous doubt, despair, and dark confusion of the soul a lonely man must know, for he is . . . sustained and cheered and aided by no party, he is given comfort by no creed, he has no faith in him except his own. And often that faith deserts him, leaving him shaken and filled with impotence. And then it seems to him that his life has come to nothing, that he is ruined, lost, and broken past redemption, and that morning—bright, shining morning, with its promise of new beginnings—will never come upon the earth as it did once.[7]

It is clear that this description of the experience of the lonely man drives beyond superficial explanations. Such a man needs something more than suggestions on how to win friends and influence people. He is not going to respond readily to six easy lessons on how to acquire peace of mind.

Wolfe also rejects the notion that such a man is some kind of exception—"far from being a rare and curious phenomenon, peculiar to myself and to a few other solitary men."[8] But Wolfe does admit that, though there is no difference in kind at this point in human experience, there could certainly be a difference in degree—"if my experience of loneliness has not been different in kind from that of other men, I suspect it has been sharper in intensity."[9] Many other men have similarly described this experience in its "intensity." Kierkegaard is one of them. He once set it down that "it is terrible . . . to walk without meeting a single traveller."[10] Wilhelm Pauck quotes a well-known passage of Luther's in which the Reformer explained this experience

6 *Ibid.*, p. 187.
7 *Ibid.*, p. 189.
8 *Ibid.*, p. 186.
9 *Ibid.*, p. 186.
10 Kierkegaard, *Fear and Trembling and The Sickness Unto Death*, tr. by Walter Lowrie, Doubleday Anchor Books (Garden City, New York, 1954), p. 86.

in such a way as to show how common it really is, even when not known intensively. Said Luther:

> There is nothing more worthless and more despised than a dry leaf that lies on the ground; worms crawl over it; it cannot ward off even the smallest speck of dust. . . . But there comes a time when its rustling will scare man and horse, spike and armour, kings and princes, the power of the whole army and even such spiteful and angry tyrants as cannot be scared either by the fear of hell or by God's wrath and judgment, but only become still prouder and more hardened by such threats. Aren't we fine fellows? We do not fear God's anger but stand stiffly unmoved by it. But we can be scared and frightened by the anger of an impotent, dry leaf, and the rustling of such a leaf can make the world too narrow for us and become a wrathful God to us.[11]

One of the most interesting and significant studies of the experience of the lonely man is Rudolph Otto's *The Idea of the Holy.* Although Otto is primarily a theologian, he cites selections from world literature throughout his book. This is how he states his thesis:

> "Holiness"—"the holy"—is a category of interpretation and valuation peculiar to the sphere of religion. . . . We generally take "holy" as meaning "completely good"; it is the absolute moral attribute, denoting the consummation of moral goodness. . . . But this common usage of the term is inaccurate. It is true that . . . moral significance is contained in the word "holy," but it includes in addition—as even we cannot but feel—a clear overplus of meaning, and this it is now our task to isolate. Nor is this merely a later or acquired meaning; rather, "holy," or at least the equivalent words in Latin and Greek, in Semitic and other ancient languages, denoted first and foremost *only* this overplus: if the ethical element was present at all, at any rate it was not original and never constituted the whole meaning of the word. . . . Accordingly, it is worth while . . . to find a word to stand for this element in isolation, this "extra" in the meaning of the "holy" above and beyond the meaning of goodness. . . . For this purpose I adopt a word coined from the Latin *numen. Omen* has given us *ominous,* and there is no reason why from *numen* we should not similarly form a word *"numinous."* I shall speak then of a unique "numinous" category of value and of a definitely "numinous" state of mind. . . . This mental state is perfectly *sui generis* and irreducible to any other; and therefore, like every absolutely primary and elementary datum, while it admits of being discussed, it cannot be strictly defined.[12]

Does this not sound like an effort to penetrate as far as possible into the meaning of Wolfe's "simple, sensuous, and passionate" language,

11 Wilhelm Pauck, *The Heritage of the Reformation* (Boston, 1950), p. 22.

12 Rudolph Otto, *The Idea of the Holy,* tr. by John W. Harvey (London, 1943), pp. 5 ff. Also see Jaroslav Pelikan, *Fools for Christ* (Philadelphia, 1955).

into the very inner core of the lonely man's experience? But first, let us start nearer the circumference and see how and where we are led by some fascinating men like Jude Fawley, Captain Ahab, and Pieter van Vlaanderen. And we cannot afford to neglect the "man in the Land of Uz, whose name was Job,"[13] for Wolfe says that "the most tragic, sublime, and beautiful expression of human loneliness which I have ever read is the Book of Job."[14] Many have agreed. Starting a little way out on the edge of things with these men, we shall try to move in and see how they might be related to what Rudolph Otto describes as the center, the "numinous."

II

Notice how the lonely man is never quite at home with his fellows. He is often thought of as being just a little "queer." Job himself is often considered unorthodox for asking some of the questions he did, and making some of the charges he made. He is certainly not comforted by his "comforters" who simply do not understand him and are unable really to sympathize with him. "To him that is afflicted pity should be shewed from his friend," said Job (6:14). As their conversation continues, he puts some sharp edges on his remarks. "But ye are forgers of lies, ye are all physicians of no value" (13:4). "Miserable comforters are ye all" (16:1). "How long will ye vex my soul, and break me in pieces with words? These ten times have ye reproached me: ye are not ashamed that ye make yourselves strange to me" (19:2, 3). This is hardly a man at peace with his fellows! Indeed, he is down on humanity in general. He bewails the frailty of man. "Is there not an appointed time to man upon earth? are not his days also like the days of an hireling? . . . So am I made to possess months of vanity, and wearisome nights are appointed to me" (7:1, 3). "Man that is born of a woman is for few days, and full of trouble. He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down: he fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not" (14:1, 2).

Jude the Obscure[15] (the very title giving away the loneliness of

13 Job 1:1. All citations from the Book of Job are from the King James Version.

14 Wolfe, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

15 Thomas Hardy (1840-1928), English novelist and poet, known for his fatalism and determinism, did a lot of his writing around the themes of metaphysical speculation and social radicalism. In a period when Victorian prudery was on the wane, he was still severely criticized for some of his stories, and *Jude the Obscure* won him many enemies.

this story) is primarily about a man and woman who are estranged from their society. From the beginning of the story certain words and phrases indicate to us how Jude Fawley is isolated from his fellows. He is an orphaned child with "thwarted desires,"[16] "living in a world which did not want"[17] him. His life is "puny and sorry,"[18] unnecessary,"[19] and "his existence . . . an undemanded one."[20] He was "impressed with the isolation of his own personality,"[21] and he came to feel that he was not even a "sufficiently dignified person for suicide."[22]

Dreaming of college study and social success, Jude "was outside the gates of everything, colleges included."[23] Throughout he remains an outcast, and toward the end of the novel he says, "Well, I'm an outsider to the end of my days."[24] One almost feels that Hardy is too unsympathetic with Jude and cuts him off unnecessarily from human relationships.

"All men tragically great are made so through a certain morbidness," wrote Herman Melville in *Moby-Dick*.[25] Nor are we left in doubt for long about the isolation of Captain Ahab from his fellows. Shortly after the Pequod sets sail on her famous whaling expedition, Ishmael, the narrator, tells us:

> For several days after leaving Nantucket, nothing above hatches was seen of Captain Ahab. . . . Every time I ascended to the deck from my watches below, I instantly gazed aft to mark if any strange face were visible; for my first vague disquietude touching the unknown captain, now in the seclusion of the sea, became almost a perturbation.[26]

And so it goes throughout the story, with Ahab's isolation continuing

16 Thomas Hardy, *Jude the Obscure* (New York, The Modern Library, 1923), p. 10.
17 *Ibid.*, p. 10.
18 *Ibid.*, p. 10.
19 *Ibid.*, p. 12.
20 *Ibid.*, p. 13.
21 *Ibid.*, p. 90.
22 *Ibid.*, p. 79.
23 *Ibid.*, p. 98.
24 *Ibid.*, p. 390.
25 Herman Melville, *Moby-Dick, or The Whale*, ed. by Willard Thorpe (New York, 1947), p. 70. Melville (1819-1891), possessor of a powerful prose style and a master in the use of symbols and analogies, has recently received much attention as one of America's great writers, and in *Moby-Dick* some critics see America's greatest novel.
26 *Ibid.*, p. 113.

and becoming more mysterious and strange in its significance. One cannot help picturing him standing there on the Pequod's quarter deck,

> the whole grim aspect of Ahab, . . . looking straight out beyond the ship's ever-pitching prow. There was an infinity of firmest fortitude, a determinate, unsurrenderable wilfulness, in the fixed and fearless forward dedication of that glance. Not a word he spoke; nor did his officers say aught to him. . . . And not only that, but moody stricken Ahab stood before them with a crucifixion in his face; in all the nameless regal overbearing dignity of some mighty woe.[27]

Yes, "it's queer; very queer; and he's queer too,"[28] as about "every twenty-four hours, when the watches of the night were set, and the band on deck sentinelled the slumbers of the band below," and "the old man would emerge, gripping at the iron banister, to help his crippled way,"[29] and then paced the deck in his lonely isolation. The captain's separation from normal human relationships is almost complete. "Socially, Ahab was inaccessible. Though nominally included in the census of Christendom, he was still an alien to it."[30]

A similar reserve and estrangement are basic to the character of Pieter van Vlaanderen in Alan Paton's recent novel, *Too Late the Phalarope*.[31] "He was always two men":[32] "the gentleness and the tenderness, the black moods and the coldness."[33] The trouble comes with "the black mood, what we call the *swartgallegheid,* which is the black gall."[34] His aunt, the lovable and compassionate narrator of the story, tells us:

> The lights went out suddenly in the house of the soul, and its doors and windows were shut and its curtains were drawn, and the man stood there outside it in the dark, with cold and formal welcome, like one who keeps you on the stoop and makes his face into the fashion of a smile, and speaks all quietly and courteous, but you know he will not ask you in.[35]

27 *Ibid.*, p. 115.
28 *Ibid.*, p. 118.
29 *Ibid.*, p. 117.
30 *Ibid.*, p. 142.
31 Alon Paton, a contemporary South African writer, not afraid to use the complex and explosive material of his native scene for his themes, was immediately hailed as a great new talent for his first novel, *Cry, the Beloved Country.* Now his second novel has called forth more praise.
32 Alon Paton, *Too Late the Phalarope* (New York, 1953), p. 3.
33 *Ibid.*, p. 4.
34 *Ibid.*, p. 138.
35 *Ibid.*, p. 77.

Pieter attempts to understand himself and sets down this explanation in his diary: "I thought I had perhaps been too obedient as a boy, too anxious to please and win approval, so that I learned to show outwardly what I was not within."[36] But when the plot has unravelled somewhat, we discover his lonely inwardness has deeper roots, at least to the aunt, who refers to "the Lord of all compassion, who made us all, and filled us with dark strange things."[37]

It was certainly in large part due to the "dark strange things" that Pieter was separate from others and so was led to destruction. "Because he would not tell one man, therefore the whole world knew."[38] Much is made of the fact that because of his isolation from others, even though he had many opportunities for fellowship, he was struck down. Perhaps back of his difficulty is the misery of the lonely, tortured, struggling soul of an individual. Like Job, and others, Pieter cried out in his time of troubles:

> In . . . twelve hours the whole world had changed, because of one insensate act. And what madness made a man pursue something so unspeakable? . . . Such desire could not merely be a desire of the flesh, but some mad desire of a sick and twisted soul. And why should I have it? And where did it come from? And how did one cure it? But I had no answers to these questions.[39]

III

So the lonely man is not just cut off from his fellows, but behind this isolation is the wretchedness and misery of the human lot and the experience of being at odds with God himself. For Job it seems that God has set himself against his servant.

> God hath delivered me to the ungodly, and turned me over into the hands of the wicked. I was at ease, but he hath broken me asunder: he hath also taken me by my neck, and shaken me to pieces, and set me up for his mark (16:11, 12).

> For the arrows of the Almighty are within me, the poison whereof drinketh up my spirit: the terrors of God do set themselves in array against me (6:4).

> I will say unto God, Do not condemn me; shew me wherefore thou contendest

36 *Ibid.*, p. 85.
37 *Ibid.*, p. 199.
38 *Ibid.*, p. 267.
39 *Ibid.*, p. 163.

with me. Is it good unto thee that thou shouldest oppress, that thou shouldest despise the work of thine hands, and shine upon the counsel of the wicked? . . . Thine hands have made me and fashioned me together round about; yet thou dost destroy me (10:2, 3, 8).

Job is at war with God, and being a man of integrity, he puts up a fierce battle, like Jacob wrestling with the angel. "How long," he asks, "how long wilt thou not depart from me, nor let me alone till I swallow down my spittle" (7:19)? He is aware that it is of little avail to remonstrate with the Almighty, for "how should man be just with God? If he will contend with him, he cannot answer him one of a thousand. . . . For he is not a man, as I am, that should answer him, and we should come together in judgment" (9:2, 3, 32). But this is still not enough for Job. "I am afraid," he says (9:28, 21:6, 23:15). Indeed, he wants to get with God, to solve this mystery, to satisfy his longing, to conquer his wretchedness and isolation. But how can he do it? Where is God? "Oh that I knew where I might find him; that I might come even to his seat" (23:3)!

The obscure Jude Fawley, in a "stranded situation,"[40] "thrown back entirely on himself, as formerly, with the added gloom of a weakened hope,"[41] in his efforts to get on the inside with his fellows, never seems to come to a war with God as Job does. Thomas Hardy intended him to be a tragic person. His beloved Sue said to him: "You are Joseph, the dreamer of dreams, dear Jude. And a tragic Don Quixote. And sometimes you are St. Stephen, who, while they were stoning him, could see heaven opened. Oh, my poor friend and comrade, you'll suffer yet!"[42] But why? Because he is a down-and-outer who never gets up-and-in? Hardy suggests this throughout the novel, but in such a way as to make one wonder whether the author does not sacrifice the humanity of his characters for the sake of social criticism.[43]

But there is more to it than this, as there almost always was for Thomas Hardy. There may not be struggle with God, but there is recognition of a kind of dark, inscrutable, even malignant fatalism at

40 Hardy, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

41 *Ibid.*, p. 133.

42 *Ibid.*, p. 242.

43 Robert Charles Slack, "Thomas Hardy, 1840-1928, A Variorum Edition of Thomas Hardy's Jude the Obscure," Ph.D. Thesis, University of Pittsburgh, 1953, suggests that this novel was a defense of non-conformity, of those ostracized by society, of nearly anarchistic individualism, and was intended to be extreme in its "naturalism."

work in history and the destinies of men. Jude is "predestinate"[44] and has an "evil star."[45] About half way through the story we find that Jude discovers a vague sort of opposition from outside human society in "the scorn of Nature for man's finer emotions, and her lack of interest in his aspirations."[46] One should observe that "nature" is capitalized! Sue makes the interesting observation: "There is something external to us which says, 'You sha'n't!' First it said, 'You sha'n't learn!' Then it said, 'You sha'n't labor!' Now it says, 'You sha'n't love!' "[47]

But did Hardy, after all, avoid the profounder issues of his character's lives by a too topical treatment of their tragedy? It seems to me quite possible, for, as Kierkegaard has remarked, "to strive against the whole world is a comfort, to strive with oneself is dreadful."[48] And this dimension of dread, this category of terror, seems too superficially treated in Jude's existence. "Apart from the terror," observed Kierkegaard, "one does not know the great at all."[49]

There is plenty of the terror, and profoundly so, in the "madness" of Captain Ahab as he pursues his bloody quest for the White Whale. Melville makes it clear, early in the story, that something is radically and desperately wrong with the human situation. In the opening paragraphs he speaks of the meaning of "that story of Narcissus, who because he could not grasp the tormenting, mild image he saw in the fountain, plunged into it and was drowned. But that same image, we ourselves see in all rivers and oceans. It is the image of the ungraspable phantom of life."[50] In his thoughts about "the ungraspable phantom" Melville uses the analogy of weaving a mat to deal with the concepts of necessity, free will, and chance.[51]

But as the action of the story mounts, all these reflections become personified in the struggles and conflicts of the characters. The captain cries out to his reluctant first mate, Starbuck, in the closing chapters:

Ahab is for ever Ahab, man. This whole act's immutably decreed. 'Twas rehearsed

44 Hardy, *op. cit.*, p. 45.
45 *Ibid.*, p. 83.
46 *Ibid.*, p. 208.
47 *Ibid.*, p. 401.
48 Kierkegaard, *op. cit.*, p. 123.
49 *Ibid.*, p. 86.
50 Melville, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
51 *Ibid.*, p. 201 f.

by thee and me a billion years before this ocean rolled. Fool! I am the Fates' Lieutenant; I act under orders.[52]

And as Moby-Dick, the White Whale, came churning up against the men and their ship, he

seemed combinedly possessed by all the angels that fell from heaven. . . . Retribution, swift vengeance, eternal malice were in his whole aspect, and spite of all that mortal man could do, the solid white buttress of his forehead smote the ship's starboard bow, till men and timbers reeled.[53]

Is Captain Ahab mad? If he is, it is a strange kind of madness, one not too unlike Job's "sickness" when he remonstrates with God! The captain asks himself:

What is it, what nameless, inscrutable, unearthly thing is it; what cozening, hidden lord and master, and cruel, remorseless emperor commands me; that against all natural lovings and longings, I so keep pushing, and crowding, and jamming myself on all the time; recklessly making me ready to do what in my own proper, natural heart I durst not so much as dare? Is Ahab, Ahab? Is it I, God, or who, that lifts this arm?[54]

Who is it? Ahab? Evil? Might it even be, in some "hidden" manner, the other side of God? What some have called God's "foreign work," the work of his left hand (Martin Luther), that which is "at the limits of God's creation, on the left side, even as God himself is on the limits of it on the right?"[55] At any rate, the struggle goes on, and when the ship gets knocked from under him, Ahab is still fighting: "Towards thee I roll, thou all-destroying but unconquering whale; to the last I grapple with thee."[56]

And what is the meaning of the Whale? Is it the symbol of Evil? Or is it, too, in some strange way, the other side of God?[57]

52 *Ibid.*, p. 520.
53 *Ibid.*, pp. 525, 529.
54 *Ibid.*, p. 503.
55 Karl Barth, *Prayer, According to the Catechisms of the Reformation*, tr. by Sara F. Terrien (Philadelphia, 1952), pp. 72, 73.
56 Melville, *op. cit.*, p. 530.
57 Paton, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

When we turn to Pieter van Vlaanderen we find the story pitched on a lower key, though the struggle is there, with self and with God.

> When the mad sickness came on me, it would suddenly move nearer to me, and I knew it would strike me down if it could, and I did not care. It was only when the sickness had passed that I saw how terrible was my danger, and how terrible too my sickness, that when it was on me my wife and children could be struck down, and I would not care.[58]

This is the misery of man, "the story of the shining star that had fallen into the mud." It is a hard and horrible thing, this misery of man. There are three days of guilty terror in *Too Late the Phalarope* that are almost unparalleled anywhere in modern fiction for their suspense and anxiety.

> The great waves of fear rose yet higher and higher, and all his strength was drained out of his body, and his face was white as death, so that it would have been God's mercy for him to die. He was afraid he might stumble and fall there in the street, so he went into our little park. . . . And all the people went by in the street, and saw only the lieutenant (Pieter) taking a few moments from his duty, . . . and did not know it was a man in agony, calling on God for mercy.[59]

It is the lovable aunt—the narrator—who registers the complaint: "Child, I understood you, and every word you ever wrote. And I say to myself, my God, my God, what did he do to be destroyed?"[60]

What does it all mean? If a man is cut off from his society—and worse still, at war with his Creator—what can it mean? In the search for meaning mankind is like Kappie, the friend of Pieter, who knew something, but only enough to be mystified. Kappie had in his hands "a puzzle with a hundred pieces, with a picture all but complete, with six or seven pieces that would not fit at all, whatever way you turned them; so that you knew this could not be the picture at all, but that the real picture must be something strange and different, and that the parts that looked complete must be something quite other, if these six or seven pieces were to be made to fit."[61]

58 *Ibid.*, p. 160.
59 *Ibid.*, p. 175.
60 *Ibid.*, p. 197.
61 *Ibid.*, p. 187 f.

IV

Job wondered what it meant when he became estranged from man and God. "Wherefore is light given to him that is in misery, and life unto the bitter in soul? . . . Why is light given to a man whose way is hid, and whom God hath hedged in" (3:20, 23)? "But where shall wisdom be found and where is the place of understanding" (28:12)? Job wonders, of course, why "the wicked live, become old, yea, are mighty in power" (21:7). And the obverse of this question, "Why do the righteous suffer?" But this particular problem is really just the painful point at which a sense of the meaninglessness of all life afflicts him.

When the terrible death of their children overtook Jude Fawley and Sue, Sue reminisced:

> We said—do you remember?—that we would make a virtue of joy. I said it was Nature's intention, Nature's law and *raison d'etre,* that we should be joyful in what instincts she afforded us—instincts which civilization has taken upon itself to thwart. What dreadful things I said! And now Fate has given us this stab in the back for being such fools as to take Nature at her word![62]

The ending of *Jude the Obscure* is filled with terrible irony and bitter pathos. Jude, who started out a believer, and even desired to enter the service of the church, winds up beaten, disillusioned, anti-church, and apparently with no saving faith of his own—only with the wish to die. Sue, who started out "free" from the "superstition" of religion, winds up a desperate and unhappy member of the church, but a defeated woman. What can it all mean? Jude wondered as he lay dying: "And I here. And Sue defiled!"[63]

Hardy gives the impression that the only answer and cause of such meaninglessness is an unnatural social progress. But he never quite explains things in this way because there is always an element of some huge, incomprehensible fatalism behind the scenes. Hardy says of Jude, the stone-cutter who wanted a college education and died frustrated because he did not get it: "This was his form of the modern vice of unrest."[64] In a speech toward the end, Jude says of himself: "I was, perhaps, after all, a paltry victim to the spirit of mental and

62 Hardy, *op. cit.*, p. 402 f.
63 *Ibid.*, p. 482.
64 *Ibid.*, p. 96.

social restlessness that makes so many unhappy in these days."[65] When his unfortunate little son committed suicide, Jude said:

It was in his nature to do it. The doctor says there are such boys springing up amongst us—boys of a sort unknown in the last generation—the outcome of new views of life. They seem to see all its terrors before they are old enough to have staying power to resist them. He says it is the beginning of the coming universal wish not to live. He's an advanced man, the doctor; but he can give no consolation to—[66]

Where is the consolation for anyone in the midst of the unrest and the wish not to live?

Melville, too, is concerned with "the ungraspable phantom." When First Mate Starbuck charges Captain Ahab with possible blasphemy, not to mention madness, for wanting to revenge himself on a dumb brute of a whale, Ahab answers:

Hark ye yet again—the little lower layer. All visible objects, man, are but as pasteboard masks. But in each event—in the living act, the undoubted deed—there, some unknown but still reasoning thing puts forth the mouldings of its features from behind the unreasoning mask. If man will strike, strike through the mask! . . . I see in him [the Whale] outrageous strength, with an inscrutable malice sinewing it. That inscrutable thing is chiefly what I hate; and be the white whale agent, or be the white whale principal, I will wreak that hate upon him.[67]

What is the inscrutable mystery of life behind the masks which veil it?

It is helpful to know that two centuries before Captain Ahab went on his voyage to strike through the mask to the inscrutable things of life, Martin Luther was also concerned about the "masks," or "veils," or "creatures" behind which God is "hidden," and through which he "reveals" himself. This whole matter has undergone much restudy by modern students of the thought of the sixteenth century Reformation. For example, Philip S. Watson writes:

For Luther, . . . to know God is something other than reaching conclusions or receiving information about Him. . . . [Such a God] is not the living God with whom we have to do. . . . For Luther, God is not to be sought behind his creation by inference from it, but is rather to be apprehended in and through it. . . . [But]

65 *Ibid.*, p. 387.
66 *Ibid.*, p. 400.
67 *Ibid.*, pp. 153, 154.

man cannot see God, in His naked transcendence, and live (Ex. 33:20, Prov. 17:15, 25:27). God, therefore, must wear as it were a "mask" or "veil" (*larva, involucrum*) in all His dealings with men, to shield them from the unapproachable light of his majesty. . . . [So the "masks" or "veils"] are not to be set aside in a quest for God, so to say, behind the scenes, for they may rather be said to represent Him on the stage, where He Himself in fact plays the principal part.[68]

Was it madness, or the search for meaning, or do the two get together to drive Captain Ahab to strike through the mask?

Pieter van Vlaanderen, undone by his particular kind of "mad sickness," afflicted by "the dark black mood," separated from his family because the "phalarope" is too late—love and meaning are too late—wonders what it all means and how he can find the answers.

He went home, filled with loathing of himself too deep to be uttered. . . . He thought of the words that are written, ask and it shall be given, search and it shall be found, knock and it shall be opened, but they . . . held some secret that he could not find. And he thought of those other words that are written, no man shall be tempted beyond his power, but they too held some meaning that he could not find.[69]

When the young, new domine came to town, in his first sermon he pointed to this same restlessness and search for meaning as the malady of this generation.

You could see he was a bit excited, and he slapped his hand down hard on the wood of the pulpit. That's the sickness of our times. . . . We think of ourselves as men in chains, in the prison of our natures and the world, able to do nothing, but having to suffer everything. God's plan? Ah, that's another thing that's done to us, history, and war, and narrow parents, and poverty, and sickness, and sickness of the soul, there's nothing we can do but to suffer them. It's a lie, he said, and again he struck the wood with his hand. It's the lie we tell to ourselves to hide the truth of our weakness and lack of faith. . . . I knew a man that counted the days. . . . He was waiting for death, though he didn't know it, because he was afraid of life, though he didn't know that either.[70]

V

The "sickness" about which the young domine got so excited sounds very much like the despair the modern existentialist school of

68 Philip S. Watson, *Let God Be God* (Philadelphia, 1948), pp. 78, 79.
69 Paton, *op. cit.*, pp. 229, 230.
70 *Ibid.*, p. 72.

philosophy is preoccupied with, and which Søren Kierkegaard has so profoundly analyzed as the "sickness unto death."

> The torment of despair is precisely this, not to be able to die. . . . So to be sick unto death is not to be able to die—yet not as though there were hope of life; no, the hopelessness in this case is that even the last hope, death, is not available. When death is the greatest danger, one hopes for life; but when one becomes acquainted with an even more dreadful danger, one hopes for death. So when the danger is so great that death has become one's hope, despair is the disconsolateness of not being able to die. It is in this last sense that despair is the sickness unto death, this agonizing contradiction, this sickness in the self, everlastingly to die, to die and yet not to die, to die the death.[71]

To want to die, to escape life, is one of the attempted answers to the question of the inscrutable thing behind the mask which drives man. Job considered this, and some of his famous words are quoted by Jude Fawley on his deathbed. It also occurred to Pieter van Vlaanderen during his days of terror. And Ahab, at the last, flung his very life at the White Whale.

But to die is not the answer, at least not for Job and Pieter. One is not so sure about Jude. Even though an early suicide attempt in his life failed, at the end he goes out, a sick man, into stormy weather, and on his return says: "I made up my mind that a man confined to his room by inflammation of the lungs, a fellow who had only two wishes left in the world—to see a particular woman and then to die—could neatly accomplish those two wishes at one stroke by taking this journey in the rain that I've done. I have seen her . . . and I've finished myself—put an end to a feverish life which ought never to have begun."[72] But one questions whether this is the real solution to Jude's problem. Nor is one persuaded by Ahab's suicidal attack on Moby-Dick that he has found the answer to his questions. Thomas Wolfe, too, as we shall see, is in some doubt about this answer by death to the riddle of life. The answer by death, although entertained by Job and these others, is too easy an escape for the lonely man who wrestles with God himself. Somehow the lonely man, if he plumbs the depths, must suffer the despair and disconsolateness of not being able to die, and yet somehow overcome that despair.

71 Kierkegaard, *op. cit.*, pp. 150, 151.
72 Hardy, *op. cit.*, p. 467.

Another answer is to try and recapture "the good old days," to live in the past. This also occurred to Job, who "continued his parable, and said, Oh that I were as in months past, as in the days when God preserved me" (29:1, 2). Jude and Sue remember their summer of happiness, when like joyful and unaffected creatures of the field they roamed the countryside without being anxious over the evil of today or tomorrow. Captain Ahab has a young wife, just recently wedded to him, but he cannot return to her. Pieter remembers his moments of joy with wife and family. But the days of innocence and peace are past. They cannot be recalled, and one cannot go back to them. *Now* is the time, and the times are out of joint with the sickness unto death. As it is said in the requiem, "What then shall I say, poor man that I am?"

VI

Early in his life, because of an incident in which his father denied him some stamps he wanted for his collection, Pieter's aunt tells us that "that was the day when he first armoured himself against the hurts and the world."[73] At the end, when they are preparing to take him—a man struck down—to prison, the aunt comments again: "Ah, why must we armour ourselves? Oh that we had some deeper love and knowledge, that no child would ever again be hurt."[74] And although Thomas Wolfe's description of the lonely man's experience has a positive thrust, he too had "times when anything, everything . . . can in an instant strip me of my armor. . . ." Man is thus pictured for us as being alone, his naked self quivering like a raw nerve before the Riddle, the seemingly wrathful and very live Question Mark. The armor—whatever kind man finds or devises—will hardly shield him, and most certainly stifles him, so that he cannot stand and walk as a man in it. But without it how can he even exist—or why exist?

Job asked: "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean" (14:4)? How can I be saved? He appears to be asking for a Redeemer —even for God, his enemy, to rescue him! And in spite of such an impossibility, Job will not let go of God. "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him" (13:15). "I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: And though after my skin

73 Paton, *op. cit.*, p. 30.
74 *Ibid.*, p. 262.

worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God" (19:25, 26). Job's faith is rewarded, for "the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind. . . . Then Job answered the Lord, and said, I know that thou canst do every thing, and that no thought can be witholden from thee. . . . Therefore have I uttered that I understood not; things too wonderful for me, which I knew not. . . . I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear: but now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes" (38:1; 42:1, 2, 3, 5, 6). Job, the lonely man, is one again with God and with men, even in their orthodoxy. But orthodoxy with what a difference! Rudolph Otto asks,

> What is this strange "moment" of experience that here operates at once as a vindication of God to Job and a reconciliation of Job to God? . . . In the last resort it relies on something quite different from anything that can be exhaustively rendered in rational concepts, namely, on the sheer absolute wondrousness that transcends thought, on the *mysterium,* presented in its pure, nonrational form. All the glorious examples from nature speak very plainly in this sense. The eagle . . . the ostrich . . . the "wild ass" and the unicorn . . . the "wild goat" and the hind . . . the hippopotamus (behemoth) and crocodile (leviathan) . . . and the whole context, tenor, and sense of the entire passage, do express in masterly fashion the downright stupendousness, the well nigh demonic and wholly incomprehensible character of the eternal creative power; how, incalculable and "wholly other," it mocks all conceiving but can yet stir the mind to its depths, fascinate and overbrim the heart. What is meant is the *mysterium* not as mysterious simply, but at the same time also as "fascinating" and "august." . . . The *mysterium,* simply as such, would merely . . . be a part of the "absolute inconceivability" of the *numen,* and that . . . could not convict him [Job] inwardly. That of which we are conscious is rather an *intrinsic value* in the incomprehensible . . . [which] remains in all its mystery. But it is as it becomes felt in consciousness that Elohim is justified and at the same time Job's soul is brought to peace.[75]

Jude, the obscure, dies without such an experience. Perhaps as close as he ever comes to a rescue is when he says, in reply to Sue's quoting "Charity seeketh not her own, in that chapter we are at one, ever beloved darling, and on it we'll part friends. Its verses will stand fast when all the rest that you call religion has passed away!"[76] Thomas Hardy seems to want the answer to be in terms of Jude's dying explanation:

> As for Sue and me, when we were at our best, long ago—when our minds were clear, and our love of truth fearless—the time was not ripe for us! Our ideas

75 Otto, *op. cit.,* pp. 81 ff.
76 Hardy, *op. cit.,* p. 431.

were fifty years too soon to be any good to us. And so the resistance they met with brought reaction in her, and recklessness and ruin on me![77]

But did Hardy destroy Jude and Sue for the sake of that explanation?

Thomas Wolfe appears more passive, and perhaps more positive, in the face of the problem, and ends by trying to accept loneliness, vague and unknown as it is. He finds the lonely experience, not only destructive, but also creative. "The eternal paradox of it is that if a man is to know the triumphant labor of creation, he must for long periods resign himself to loneliness, and suffer loneliness to rob him of the health, the confidence, the belief and joy which are essential to creative work."[78] Speaking of the "gloomy, gray, and unbrokenly dismal" character of loneliness, Wolfe cites Job to prove that this is not all that can be said.

For the Book of Job, far from being dreary, gray, and dismal, is woven entire, more than any single piece of writing I can recall, from the sensuous, flashing, infinitely various, and gloriously palpable material of great poetry; and it wears at the heart of its tremendous chant of everlasting sorrow the exulting song of everlasting joy.[79]

Referring to the Jobean description of the war horse, he writes:

That is joy—joy solemn and triumphant; stern, lonely, everlasting joy, which has in it the full depth and humility of man's wonder, his sense of glory, and his feeling of awe before the mystery of the universe. An exultant cry is torn from our lips as we read the lines about that glorious horse, and the joy we feel is wild and strange, lonely and dark like death.[80]

And finally, Wolfe has a vague confidence that the lonely man's faith will come back to him. "It will rise up in him with a jubilant and invincible power, bursting a window in the world's great wall and restoring everything to shapes of deathless brightness."[81] But does Wolfe, by seeing creativity and joy in loneliness, and having a vague hope in the recurrence of meaning in times of despair, really get beyond "the

77 *Ibid.*, p. 478.
78 Wolfe, *op. cit.*, p. 187.
79 *Ibid.*, p. 191.
80 *Ibid.*, p. 193.
81 *Ibid.*, p. 189.

sickness unto death?" Are not his answers a little too easy? He, too, felt there was something more.

> Just as the Old Testament becomes the chronicle of the life of loneliness, the gospels of the New Testament . . . become the chronicle of the life of love. . . . The central purpose of Christ's life . . . is to destroy the life of loneliness and to establish here on earth the life of love. . . . [But] I can only say that I could not make his [Christ's] way my own. For I have found the constant, everlasting weather of man's life to be, not love, but loneliness. . . . How or why or in what way the flower of love will come to us, whether with life or death, triumph or defeat, joy or madness, no man on this earth can say. But I know that at the end, forever at the end for us—the driven wanderers of life, the lonely men—there waits forever the dark visage of our comrade, Loneliness.[82]

What a different ending from Jude and Job! Captain Ahab ends still differently! The secret of meaning in *Moby-Dick* would seem to be centered in the meaning of "The White Whale," the mask. And the "whiteness" of that mask contains the inner secret! Apparently it means different things to different people, for Ishmael says: "What the white whale was to Ahab, has been hinted: what, at times, he was to me, as yet remains unsaid."[83]

It is interesting and significant to note that in setting forth his meaning, Ishmael uses the analogy of "the White Steed of the Prairies," a horse not unlike the war horse Jehovah described to Job in his reconciliation speech.

> He was the elected Xerxes of vast herds of wild horses. . . . At their flaming head he westward trooped, like that chosen star which every evening leads on the hosts of light. The flashing cascade of his mane, the curving comet of his tail, invested him with housings more resplendent than gold and silver-beaters could have furnished him. A most imperial and archangelical apparition of that unfallen, western world, which to the eyes of the old trappers and hunters revived the glories of those primeval times when Adam walked majestic as a god. . . . In whatever aspect he [the White Steed] presented himself, always to the bravest Indians he was the object of trembling reverence and awe. Nor can it be questioned from what stands on legendary record of this noble horse, that it was his spiritual whiteness chiefly, which so clothed him with divineness; and that this divineness had that in it which, though commanding worship, at the same time enforced a certain nameless terror.[84]

82 *Ibid.*, pp. 194, 196.
83 Melville, *op. cit.*, p. 176.
84 Melville, *op. cit.*, 178, 179.

Is that the inner secret of the mask? Is this God for Ishmael? But what of Ahab? Ishmael is rescued, the only one of that expedition, and is that to symbolize that the God behind the mask is a Redeemer, for all the "nameless terror" involved? Ahab can hardly be said to be saved. He seems to have been persuaded that an evil mystery was behind the mask. Although he had his doubts! Could it be that Ahab, because of whatever it was that he lacked (faith?), saw only what might be termed the other side of God, the left hand, while Ishmael's faith brought him under the rule of the right hand? Are we here confronted with the mystery of a God who somehow contains evil in such a way that when his wrath and judgment are required, they operate through evil to achieve their end? What else can one say?[85]

It seems a strange solution, this, that rescue and condemnation, love and wrath, God and the Devil, are all mixed up in one. But for the lonely man there are no simple questions to ask, and no easy answers to the questions that are asked. At the heart of everything there is mystery and terror. Even for those who believe in revelation, such as Job being confronted with the Presence, there remains the incomprehensible though "fascinating numen." Such a problem always attracts attention in times of creative theological thinking. Philip S. Watson has written:

> Luther speaks of the Incarnation as, on the one hand, a "veil" in which the God of majesty confronts us, and on the other, as a "glass" or "mirror" in which He is to be beheld. The double metaphor is illuminating. If glass suggests manifestation, veil suggests concealment. Both of these are characteristic of Luther's ideas of divine revelation. . . . [God] is at once hidden (*Deus absconditus*) and revealed (*Deus revelatus*).[86]

The God of the Incarnation, the love which Thomas Wolfe felt was supposed to overcome loneliness, figures largely in Pieter van Vlaanderen's story. One of the most unforgettable episodes of *Too Late the Phalarope* is the mounting tension of Pieter's three days of guilty terror. When there is a short respite after these days, we are

85 Cf. Wilhelm Stählin, *The Mystery of God*, tr. by R. Birch Hoyle (London, 1937). The author has not made a close enough study to document this opinion, but he believes Stählin's discussion of "the double tension of the mystery" might throw much light on this, even as his whole study would prove helpful.

86 Watson, *op. cit.*, pp. 103, 104. See also John Dillenberger's *God Hidden and Revealed* (Philadelphia, 1953).

relieved that he is not yet discovered, but we also know that charges will finally be brought and he will not be able to escape. "There is no power of God or Man or State, nor any Angel, nor anything present or to come, nor any height, nor any depth, nor any other creature that can save them, when once the word is written down."[87] Pieter's father is on the side of making his son "drink the cup of wrath."[88] When old Jakob van Vlaanderen learned of his son's fall, he had "the Book" brought to him and "he opened it at the beginning where are all the names of the van Vlaanderens, for more than a hundred and fifty years. . . . [And] he took pen and the ink, and he crossed out the name of Pieter van Vlaanderen from the Book."[89] Patriarchal Jakob cuts off himself, and the whole family, from Pieter and from society itself. And again he took "the Book and read the words of the Hundred and Ninth Psalm, which are the most terrible words that man has ever written."[90] Eight days later, Aunt Sophie tells us, "Jakob van Vlaanderen died. . . . He died alone, and no one knew he was dead until my sister-in-law found him, bowed over the Book of Job. I remembered . . . my brother's . . . voice of thunder, the point of living is to serve the Lord your God, and to uphold the honour of your church and language and people. But now he had no answer, and sought hungrily in the Book. Therefore I wrote truly when I said he was destroyed."[91] Like Ahab, he is the victim of the wrath. It only alienates man from man, and consumes man before God. It is not the answer.

For the aunt and mother there is a love which may be the answer, even though the wrath still operates. Interestingly enough, the Captain of the Police who arrests Pieter also knows something of this love. He says: "To punish and not to restore, that is the greatest of all offenses. . . . [For] if man takes unto himself God's right to punish, then he must also take upon himself God's promise to restore."[92] A little later, in speaking to Aunt Sophie, he says: "There's a hard law, *mejuffrou*, that when a deep injury is done to us, we never recover until we forgive."[93]

But love seems so weak and ineffectual in the face of the hugeness

87 Paton, *op. cit.*, p. 164.
88 *Ibid.*, p. 269.
89 *Ibid.*, p. 250.
90 *Ibid.*, p. 252 f.
91 *Ibid.*, p. 270.
92 *Ibid.*, pp. 264, 265.
93 *Ibid.*, p. 266.

and threat of man's terror. When old Jakob cut off his family from society, it is said of Pieter's younger sister: "Life struck her across the face, and brought her from a young girl's dreaming into a hard and angry world, where love seemed foolishness."[94] The young domine, when he preached his sermon about the "sickness of our times," believed there was a love not so weak and ineffectual.

> He had not come to preach only about backsliding and backsliders, but about repentance and mercy, that a man might turn again, taking his part again in God's plan for the world, so that through a man, himself healed and refreshed, might flow a stream of living water to refresh us all, his home, his church, his town, his people and the world.[95]

We must not give in to the "sickness unto despair," says the new domine, for "is there not a gospel of God's love, that God's love can transform us, making us creators, not sufferers. . . . The young domine's voice rose. I am come that ye might have life, and have it more abundantly, saith the Lord."[96]

To some extent Aunt Sophie and Pieter's mother have such a love in their lives. The mother, unable to go to her son, sends Sophie with this message:

> And you will say to my son, . . . that though he may suffer under the law, there is no law that can cut him off from our love, nor from the love of his friends. His life is God's, and mine and yours, and his wife's and children's, and all his friends'; and he will therefore cherish it and not despair.[97]

Whether Pieter ever finds this love which enables one to be at peace with man and God, and to cherish life and not give over to despair, we are not informed. Aunt Sophie concludes: "Maybe of the power of her [Pieter's mother's] love that never sought itself, men would have turned to the holy task of pardon, that the body of the Lord might not be wounded twice, and virtue come of our offenses."[98]

John Donne once said that "all divinity is love and wonder."[99]

94 *Ibid.*, p. 268.
95 *Ibid.*, p. 72.
96 *Ibid.*, pp. 72, 73.
97 *Ibid.*, pp. 255, 256.
98 *Ibid.*, p. 272.
99 John Donne's *Poetical Works*, ed. by F. J. C. Crierson (Oxford, 1912), I, 30; cf. pp. 81, 248.

The heart of the lonely man's experience seems to be largely a matter of the "wonder"—even fear, dread, and terror. The numinous center of this "wonder" repulses while at the same time it "fascinates" and draws men to it. Most seem to be consumed by the fire of the wrath in it. Can they be covered with some armor against this destruction which yet allows them to be men? But what is this covering armor, and who will provide it? Perhaps that is what Donne meant by the "love" in divinity, and what Aunt Sophie meant by the "holy task of pardon." But few of the lonely men we have considered ever knew this —certainly not with confidence, or in its completeness.

At any rate, it is no wonder that the story of Job should influence so many generations of writers, especially when they plumbed the depths of themselves or took seriously the destiny of man and the mystery of the universe, for the "man in the land of Uz" had been there before them, and "there is none like him in the earth" (1:8).

What Does a Sacrament Proffer?

By George Aus

I AM here concerned with the sacraments in general, with what the sacraments may be said to have in common, with that in which a sacrament may be said to share, and not with that which may be said to be the unique contribution or the special function of each. Accordingly I do not propose to launch into a discussion of the possible differences of function between the two sacraments, or of the relationships which may be said to exist between them, or of the relationship from the standpoint of function between the sacraments and the Word of God as means of grace.

The question—What does a sacrament proffer?—can be answered in four words. *A sacrament proffers the grace of God.* Because, however, this statement has been, and still is, liable to such tragic misunderstanding and consequent erroneous practice, it must be understood against the background of at least two things: the saying of Jesus, "I will build my church," and the New Testament understanding of the word "grace." We turn now to a discussion of each of these in turn.

Jesus had just had another clash with the Pharisees. He could sense that the opposition to his ministry was mounting in intensity. It was becoming increasingly evident that it would not be long before they would attack him openly and seek to realize their plans of doing away with him. Was the time ripe? Had his teaching and preaching efforts accomplished in the minds and hearts of his disciples what he had hoped and prayed for? Had they "caught on?" Were they ready to carry on if he were taken from them?

As they came apart to rest a while, Jesus approached his men with two queries: "Who do men say that the Son of Man is?" When he had elicited their answers to this question, he asked the all important question, "But who do ye say that I am?" For a moment there was a hushed silence. Then Peter's answer rang out, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Overjoyed, Christ responded, "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjonah, for flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee but my Father who is in heaven." Then followed the pronouncement concerning his future program, "And upon this rock I will build my church. . . ."

The Book of Acts is the record of the beginning of the fulfillment of this promise. Luke's opening words "concerning all that Jesus began both to do and to teach" suggest that what was now to be recorded was but a continuation of that which was begun in the days of his flesh.

As we move into the second chapter of the Book of Acts, we are confronted by a group of men who are gripped by a tremendous sense of mission. We soon learn that this sense of mission is rooted in the revelation to them of the meaning of the events of which they had just recently been eye witnesses. Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified at the hands of Roman soldiers on the instigation of the Jews, is alive. His resurrection is regarded as the result of a divine act. "God hath raised him from the dead." According to the testimonies of these men, the fact of his resurrection has at least three further implications for the risen Jesus. In the first place, by this event he has been constituted the Christ of God with power to act. This is evidenced by his outpouring of the Holy Spirit, the effects of which the crowd has confused with the effects of another kind of spirit. The outpouring of the Spirit, moreover, constitutes those upon whom the Spirit has come, the Messianic people—the people of the age to come. This means that the Messianic age has been ushered in. In the second place, the resurrection means that he is Lord. He who once was shamefully mistreated is now at the place of power. He is now in possession of all that he needs to accomplish his redemptive purpose. "All authority has been given unto me." He is King. The Messianic reign has now begun. In the third place, the resurrection means that he is Judge and Consummator. They now understand that the kingdom cannot be set up immediately here on earth—that the heavens must receive him "until the time of restoration." When the second fullness of time has come, however, he will return to determine the eternal destiny of all men—to decide who will enter and who will not enter the kingdom of God.

From this two more things follow. In the first place, if men are going to stand in the judgment and be saved into the kingdom, they must surrender to Jesus as Saviour and Lord, since only in him is there forgiveness of sins, and only by him is the Holy Spirit given. In the second place, if men are to surrender to Jesus Christ, they must hear the Gospel. If men are to hear the Gospel, however, it must be preached to them. Hence the urgency that is upon us to proclaim to men the salvation which is in and by Jesus Christ.

The sense of urgency growing out of the inescapable logic of their experiences manifested itself in the zeal with which the church proceeded to carry out its Lord's command to preach the Gospel.

Through the proclamation of the Gospel the company of believers grew. Through the preaching of the Word men were led to repentance and faith. Those who came to faith were baptized and thus incorporated into the Christian community. In the words of the Book of Acts, "The Lord added to them day by day those that were being saved."

The community of believers thus brought into being was characterized by a fellowship or inner unity which was not due to membership in an organization, participation in a common treasury, subscription to a creedal statement, or en-

listment in a program of world-betterment, but to their common obedience to Christ as Lord and to their common participation in the Holy Spirit. This sharing in the Holy Spirit had its source in the risen and exalted Christ who gave the Spirit to all who came to faith in him in order that they might be in vital fellowship with him and with one another.

By the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, moreover, Christ stood in immediate and vital contact with the life and work of his church. Through the presence of the Spirit he enlightened his church concerning its work and guided it in its decisions. By the Spirit he granted the boldness and the power necessary for the accomplishment of the tasks assigned. By means of the presence of the Holy Spirit in and with his church Christ bestowed upon it the gifts that were needed for edifying and equipping the body. Through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit he comforted it in trial and protected it when in danger.

The inner unity born of participation in the Holy Spirit also manifested itself in the corporate life of worship and love. Their life together centered about the teachings of the apostles, the exposition and exhortation of the prophets, the practice of prayer, and the celebration of the Supper. Their life together exercised itself in the assuming of the responsibilities of the corporate life. They shared their earthly possessions. The strong sought to strengthen the weak. The gifts of the Spirit were regarded not as means of private enjoyment or distinction, but as given for the benefit of all. Prayer was not only a matter of vertical relationship but also an expression of corporate solicitude as the members interceded for one another.

It did not take long before the church by actual experience discovered that the carrying out of its Lord's commission involved it in at least a twofold function: one in relation to the world; the other in relation to itself. In relation to the world, it was led to evangelize—i.e., to witness by word and deed to the good news of the forgiveness of sins through Jesus Christ. In relation to itself, its work was to edify. Through preaching, teaching, and the breaking of bread, and through the acting out of the Gospel in the ministry of mercy and love, the company of believers was strengthened and built up.

As the church launched out on the fulfillment of its twofold task, it discovered that from its Lord it had already received the major implementation it needed for the carrying out of its mission. As it faced the world in the task of evangelization, it had in one hand the message and in the other the sacrament of Baptism. As it faced itself in its task of edification, it had in the one hand the message and in the other the sacrament of the Supper.

Thus far the picture of the beginnings of the New Testament church. It is a picture of the risen and exalted Christ working with his disciples as they seek to carry out his twofold commission with the implementation he has given them —the message and the sacraments.

Against the background of Jesus' promise, "I will build my church," and of the record of the beginnings of its fulfillment which we have in the Book of Acts, there are a number of implications concerning the way in which the words, "A sacrament proffers the grace of God," must be understood if we are not to fall into grievous error. Some of these are:

1. A sacrament is a means. In the first place, this indicates that *it* is not the important thing but rather the person or power that uses it. In the second place, the designation of it as a means indicates that it is not an end in itself but a medium through which Christ chooses to be present and to build his church. Whatever is effected through it is not the result of power inherent in it, but is due to the presence and power of Christ. It is Christ who proffers and effects by means of it. It has its efficacy not in *itself,* but in *him.* Much error in thought and practice would be avoided if this distinction were carefully maintained.

2. The fact that something is designated a means points the mind away from the thing itself in at least two directions. The first direction in which it points is backward: Of what is it a means? Or by whom is it used? This direction we have just considered. The second direction in which it points is forward. It is indicated by the question, For what purpose or end is it used as means?

When, therefore, we say that a sacrament is a means, we are also involved in the idea of the end for which it is the means. The fact that a sacrament is a means through which Christ is at work also relates it to the goal for which he is at work—the building of his body, the church. This signifies that, as a means, a sacrament gets its meaning not from itself, but from Christ and from the purpose for which he uses it.

Thus, if we are to do justice to the picture of Christ building his church, we must set the word "sacrament" between the words "Christ" and "church," i.e., we must understand it in the light of its relationships—backward to Christ whose tool it is, and forward to his church for the building of which it is a means.

The second background against which our answer to the question—What does a sacrament proffer?—must be seen is that of the New Testament understanding of the word "grace."

In the New Testament the word "grace" has at least three points of reference.

In the first place, grace refers to what God is—to his nature, to what he is like. God *is* gracious. We can get still closer to the intent of this word if we see it as an aspect of the love of God. Love is that in the heart of God which desires the best for his creatures and which, accordingly, acts in their best interest. Love is so rich a jewel that it has many facets. In relation to those in distress, the love of God is called mercy. When the object of the love of God is an impenitent sinner and the love of God is described as waiting for the sinner's repentance, it is called long-suffering or patience. In relation to the whole of his creation, God's love takes the aspect of benevolence. Now, grace is the love of God as it goes out

to the undeserving. In himself this object of God's love deserves just the opposite of what he receives. That in his love God acts to save me and to give me the opposite of what I deserve—this is grace! Where has Paul presented this aspect of the love of God more strongly than in the "while we" clauses of Romans 5? "While we were yet weak," "while we were yet sinners," "while we were enemies," "God commended his love toward us." This is what God is like. He is gracious.

In the second place, grace refers to what God *does* because he *is* gracious. He goes in quest of the sinner. He convicts him of the wrongness of his rebellion. He offers him forgiveness. He persuades him to trust his promise. He forgives the penitent. He embraces the broken-hearted and restores them to sonship. He sends the Spirit into the hearts of forgiven sinners. He delivers from sin's dominion. He equips and empowers his church. He saves men into his kingdom. He gives men eternal life. Not one of these is ever merited! Every last one is a gracious dealing of God—something he does for the undeserving sinner because he is gracious. The supreme manifestation of God's graciousness, of course, is the Cross. That God freely chose to take upon himself the consequences of my sins—that instead of letting me go, as I deserve, he chose at such awful personal cost to make it possible for me to be restored to fellowship with himself—this is grace!

In the third place, grace is used to designate the effect of God's gracious dealing with sinful men. In Acts 11:23 we read, "Who [Barnabas] when he was come, and had seen the grace of God, was glad; and he exhorted them all, that with purpose of heart they would cleave unto the Lord." This must be understood to refer not to a quantum of grace which Barnabas saw, but to his beholding of that which God had graciously accomplished among these folks as a result of the preaching of the Gospel. Peace with God, sonship with God, the new life in Christ, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, the sharing of the believer in the holiness of God, the hope of the life to come—these are all the grace of God, i.e., they are effects of the gracious operation of God. They are the things that the gracious God works in the hearts of those who trust him.

Across the years there are at least two ways in which the word "grace" has been understood. It has been conceived in substantial terms—as a quantum which God bestows, a something which God imparts, by means of the sacraments. When thus interpreted the word "grace" is not the designation of what God *is* but of what God *has*. Thus the "offer of grace" is understood as the offer of *so much* grace; the gift of grace is regarded as the bestowal of *a quantity* of grace. The abundance of grace is interpreted to mean an *overflow* of grace.

In the light of our New Testament findings, however, this is seen to be an erroneous interpretation, for grace is not what God *has* but what he *is*—and what he *does* because of what he *is*. When thus understood, the offer of grace is not the offer of so much grace, but the offer which the gracious God makes. The gift

of grace is not the granting of a certain amount of grace, but the gift which the gracious God gives. The bestowal of grace is not the bestowal of a quantity of grace, but the designation of that which the gracious God bestows on sinful men.

On the background, therefore, of a New Testament understanding of the word "grace," our answer—"A sacrament proffers the grace of God"—must be interpreted to mean, not the proffer of an amount of grace, but the proffer which the gracious God makes.

Because this is a distinction which has far-reaching implications for the life and work of the church, it is of the utmost importance that it be observed and maintained. Here are some of its implications.

1. If grace is what God *is* and *does,* and not what he *has,* then grace is not to be thought of as something apart from or alongside of him, but as God in redemptive operation.

2. If grace is what God *is* and *does,* and not what he *has,* then a sacrament, as a means of grace, is not a means by which some of the grace that God has is deposited in men, but a means through which he graciously comes to them for the purpose of doing for them what they of themselves are not able to do and what his undeserved love alone can accomplish.

3. If a sacrament is a means through which God comes to men and graciously offers them his saving love, then a sacrament involves personal relationship, and to think of it from the standpoint of anything less than a personal confrontation is to do violence to its nature and intent. The New Testament view of grace requires that a sacrament be placed on the level of personal relationship.

4. If grace is God himself in redemptive operation and not something he dispenses, then a sacrament is an event in which the living God personally confronts men with his saving purpose. It follows, too, that every quantitative use of the word "grace" is suspect because it inevitably suggests the idea that grace is quantitative and therefore something which God *has* rather than what he *is* and *does.*

5. A quantitative conception of grace ought to be studiously avoided because it jeopardizes the doctrine of justification by faith. It opens the way to the conception of man's relation to God along sub-personal and sub-evangelical levels.

Some of these may be mentioned.

(a) If grace is something God *has* and not what he *is* and *does,* then the all-important question is not whether one is rightly related to him but whether one has some of what he has. This is true even when personal relationship with God is regarded as necessary, because in this case its necessity is not for its own sake but as a means of getting what God has. Wherever this happens, Christianity has slipped to a sub-personal level. It is no longer an I-Thou but an I-it relationship. (b) If grace is something God *has*—the bestowal of which effects such marvelous results—the idea of magic is on the threshold, for men will easily come

to regard the power manifest in the sacrament as inhering in the sacrament itself and will therefore come to look on the sacrament as desirable for its own sake, as an end instead of a means. Whenever this happens, Christianity has again sunk to a sub-personal level. It has changed from an I-Thou to an I-it relationship. (c) In the presence of this conception of grace, we are on the border of salvation by works. Since grace is *something*—something powerful and therefore desirable—and since God is in possession of this something, it is not very far to the thought that God will give away some of it in exchange for something else —that the way to get some of it is by being so and so good, or by doing so and so many good works in exchange for which God will give a corresponding amount of grace. Before we realize it, we are once more in the hopeless morass of the confusion of law and gospel. Where this happens, Christianity sinks to a sub-evangelical level because salvation is no longer something which God out of sheer grace gives to the undeserving but something which he gives to men in exchange for something which they present to him.

At the beginning of this paper it was suggested that in order to understand the meaning of our answer—"A sacrament proffers the grace of God"—it was necessary to view it against the background of Jesus' promise, "I will build my church," and of the New Testament conception of the word "grace." We have now looked at the results of these investigations and we are ready to make an attempt at saying what we mean by our answer. It involves at least four things:

1. A sacrament proffers the presence of the risen and exalted Christ. In the interim between the ascension and the parousia, when his visible presence is no longer in the midst of them, the sacraments constitute one of the ways in which Christ has chosen to be present with and for his own.

2. A sacrament proffers the presence of Christ in redemptive operation. In the interim between the ascension and the parousia, Christ is engaged in carrying his redemptive purpose to its glorious consummation. Among the means by which Christ proposes to realize his objective stand the sacraments. Through them he is not only present with his church; he is also redemptively at work in and through it.

3. A sacrament proffers participation in the redemptive energies of Christ's resurrection life. In the interim between the ascension and the parousia, Christ is building his church. This is the New Testament picture of the church as a living organism of which he is head, and of a building composed of living stones of which he is the corner. One of the means he uses for the building of his church is the sacraments. His body, however, is not only an organism but also an organ through which he is realizing his redemptive purpose in history. From this point of view the sacraments also play their part, for they constitute one of the means by which he comes to sinful men, offering them participation in the redemptive

energies of his risen life—one of the means by which he has implemented his church for the carrying out of his redemptive purpose.

4. Since all to whom Christ thus comes by means of the sacraments are sinful men, and therefore undeserving of his mercy, a sacrament may rightly be said to "proffer grace," for here the word "grace" is not understood as designating a quantum which is conveyed by the sacrament, but as referring to the fact that by means of a sacrament Jesus Christ is personally present, offering to make men sharers in the energies of his risen life through personal fellowship with him.

The Divine Service as Witness and Confession

By Martin J. Heinecken

IT HAS been decisive for my own development that I have from my youth been accustomed to a formal service of worship according to Wilhelm Loehe's Agende. To this day I feel that a service does not begin properly except with the words, "Beloved in the Lord, let us draw near with a true heart and confess our sins unto God our Father, beseeching him, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to grant us forgiveness."

Worship begins properly only if a man humbles himself utterly and, stripped of all self-righteousness, casts himself upon the righteousness of God. The old Adam is to be buried anew with Christ into his death, and a new man is to come forth to serve and praise the gracious God. It is in this spirit that the service continues until it reaches its height in the joy of the Communion, when with angels and archangels and all the company of heaven we laud and magnify the glorious Name, and then with the peace of God, which the world cannot give, return to our daily tasks in the confidence that all of life is a divine service, and that the same gracious God experienced in the church is with us in our daily life, in all its crises in which we are lost without this Saviour. Now we can sit down at the table and pray that simple and yet so profound, "Come, Lord Jesus, be thou our guest, and let these gifts to us be blest." Then, if we have the heart for it, we are conscious of the real presence of him who once sat down with publicans and sinners and ate with them. At the same time we pray the age-old "Maranatha" and long for the joy of the heavenly banquet tables in the confidence that it will not now be long.

So Loehe's Agende has come to be part of my very flesh and blood. I can still see the grannies, all decked out in their Sunday best, hurrying with rapid steps to the house of the Lord, and then walking home again with slow, measured steps, loath to leave the courts of the Lord, yet knowing that the Lord was going with them at every step.

I am very grateful for my rich liturgical heritage. At times when the preaching from the pulpit had nothing to offer, the liturgy offered a refuge. Here at least is security; here is the glad proclamation, the age-old confession in which you know yourself at one with the Christians of all generations and with the heavenly hosts. From the pulpit the preacher speaks of "spiritual values," worth more than material values, of a "highest good" offered to us in "the Christian philosophy of life," which you must not despise if you are really to "get the

most out of life." Jesus came to give us "the abundant life," and if we are not to forfeit the highest and the best, then to our cars and televisions and all the other things that are at our disposal we must also add the "intangible, spiritual values." The preacher is not aware at all of how unbiblical and contrary to the Gospel his whole discourse is, that he has not yet begun to learn the ABC of the true preacher, that is to say, the proper distinction between the Law and the Gospel. He does not realize that he is a good Platonist and an exemplary pagan in his lack of appreciation of the material things which God has made. He does not realize how he is playing right into the hands of the inborn self-centeredness of man and deliberately encouraging him to seek himself in everything, in the brother and even in God. He is not aware at all of how his sermon stands in direct contradiction to the liturgy. Either the liturgy, therefore, is a closed book to him, or else he succeeds in interpreting it to suit himself.

This leads me to express my misgivings about a liturgical movement which is not quite clear about the message and the confession of the church. I am in sympathy with much of the liturgical revival on the European continent because I realize in what great need the church stood and how impoverished the service was. I know that it meant a rediscovery of the Gospel as news and as something quite distinct from a philosophy. No "universal truths" are proclaimed there by a learned gentleman in an academic gown and hood, with his doctor's chevrons on the sleeve, who rests his authority on his reason, but there is a call to decision by a messenger who realizes the urgency of the moment, for the enemy is at the gate and the time of the end is near. Much depends, therefore, upon the liturgical action, especially upon the celebration of the Lord's Supper, where it is proclaimed to all and sundry that this is a gathering of those who know themselves to be united with their Lord and with each other as members of one body.

I understand quite clearly that the concern about the liturgy may be a concern for the Word of God, and yet I must continue to express my misgivings. My experiences have taught me that the liturgy as such is unable to preserve the Gospel, and that it will not lead men into the right community of faith and of love, if the preaching from the pulpit and the instruction do not clearly and unequivocally proclaim the Gospel. That I, when the preacher was orating his nonsense and his heresies, could find refuge in the liturgy was due to the fact that I already knew the Gospel, that I had already been apprehended in my need. That is why the liturgy could be for me both witness and confession in the evangelical sense. But with many others this was not the case. The liturgy was for them only the means for an aesthetic and religious experience, even if they had never heard of Schleiermacher. I can vouch for it that a person can participate in an orthodox liturgy every Sunday and still be dominated by the *eros* or the *nomos* motif because the preaching from the pulpit is not right.

Our situation in America is somewhat different from the European. We

have had a uniform liturgy, for the most part, all these years, and yet this liturgy has not always preserved the Gospel. So also in Anglican churches, where at the tremendous words of the Nicene Creed, "and was made man." the worshiper makes a deep genuflection, and then the learned gentleman in the pulpit succeeds in denying this absolute miracle with his philosophy. Of what use is a common liturgy if you do not hear a common message? Then Article VII of the Augsburg Confession is put in reverse. There is unity in external ceremonies, but not in the understanding of the Gospel.

The "high-church" movement, in part at least, means something different for us than for European Lutherans. For many here it is an escape, because they are too lazy or too stupid to proclaim the Gospel and to bear witness to the Christian faith, but they look very impressive in a chasuble, and lording it over others as a "priest" is very flattering to their pride.

For others, however, there is involved a real misunderstanding of the Reformation and an actual return to Rome. There is a desire to restore the "apostolic succession," and the church is conceived as an externally guaranteed institution of salvation. Grace is not understood as the gracious disposition of God in his turning to the sinner, but as "infused grace," and the various sacraments are the pipes through which the stream of grace is pumped into men. It is exactly that synthesis of *agape* and *eros* with which Luther broke. God, indeed, came down to men first, but now God and man together must climb up Jacob's ladder to the beatific vision, instead of the sinner in faith experiencing loving communion with God upon this earth and then in this love serving God in the neighbor right here upon this earth.

One more concern. We in America now have plenty of money and we know how to build beautiful churches. So we build our beautiful churches and we revel in the richness of the liturgy. Are we thereby also becoming new creatures serving the neighbor in selfless love? I do not mean to imply that we should not build our beautiful houses of worship. There is so much that lures men away from God in this world. Why should not the beauty and the joy of the freed and redeemed creation come to expression in the church and in the liturgy? Mary offered her extravagant gift of love, and the Lord did not prevent her. The poor we always have with us, and we dare never pass them by. Only with an uneasy conscience and with the prayer for forgiveness on our lips can we build our fine churches, and we must really suffer because in this life we can find no sinless way of living external expression to the purity of our God-relationship. We must continue to live only out of the grace and forgiveness of God.

Let me sum up what I have thus far said.

1. The liturgy as such is neither witness nor confession if not accompanied by and enlivened by the proper proclamation of the Word. Everything depends on how the Gospel is understood and explained. Exactly the same liturgy may

in two different contexts serve contradictory purposes. You can be so influenced by the whole atmosphere in which you live that the liturgy is simply interpreted accordingly. Chameleonlike the liturgy accommodates itself to the prevailing spirit of the times. It is as though you wore colored glasses and now saw everything in that one color. Everything, therefore, depends upon clear, unequivocal proclamation of the Word, always addressed to the contemporary situation and refuting the contemporary heresies. Neither a fixated theology nor a fixated liturgy can do this. While the liturgy does have a more permanent form, it, too, must be accommodated to the situation, and no liturgy can simply be transplanted from year to year and from land to land.

2. Nevertheless, the entire service, the church building, the songs that are sung or are not sung, how and where one assembles, the gestures employed, etc., are both witness and confession. They bear witness to the understanding of the Word of God and are a confession before God and men of what one really believes and what gods one really serves. So the simple, unadorned meeting-house of the Quakers proclaims one confession, the Roman Catholic altar with its reserved host proclaims another; the Reformed church, which gives the central place to the pulpit, still another; and the Lutheran church, which gives the central place to the altar while nevertheless setting the pulpit at its side as the sign that the action of the altar must be explained and proclaimed, still another.

3. One more preliminary consideration: The fact that, as Peter Brunner shows, all the words in the New Testament which speak of the service of God (*latreia, sebasma, sebazesthai, leitourgia, threskeia, douleia*) do not refer at all to that which we today call the divine service and the liturgy, should give us pause. In a certain sense Jesus stood unmistakably on the side of the prophets against the priests and demanded that we serve God not with the lips and external postures, but with the heart and with genuine brotherly love. Nothing is so seductive as the temptation to slip back again into ceremonialism. And yet, if we do not allow ourselves to be served of God first, then we shall not even know where to begin. First of all, we must with Mary choose the better part and sit at Jesus' feet, otherwise all our service will miscarry and be nothing but idolatry. Precisely by letting herself be served of Jesus, Mary showed that she had forgotten herself and wanted to be nothing but an empty vessel into which the Lord might now pour the water of life. Sacrament must therefore always come first, before you can even think of sacrifice. Without the sacrament (*beneficium*) every sacrifice will remain pagan. Therefore, there is something in the divine service that is absolutely essential.

And now, after this already far too lengthy introduction, the following theses:

1. According to evangelical understanding the divine service is the place where the message of Christ and the confession of the church are proclaimed and offered, appropriated and accepted through Christ's spiritual-bodily presence. Not

anywhere and everywhere is the congregation and the body of Christ, but the congregation is where the Word is proclaimed and the sacraments are administered because the living Christ is there in his grace. Here is the "skandalon," the stone that was a stumbling block to the Jews and foolishness to the Greeks, namely, that here at a definite time and place, in a human form, the fullness of the Godhead appears. Those here assembled in the name of Christ (i.e., the name of the triune God) have the incarnate Christ in their midst. This, therefore, means contemporaneity with Christ as Messiah and Redeemer. Here in the service, in the proclaimed Word, the omnipresence of God becomes the presence-for-us, i.e., the unknown God of creation and the God of wrath of the natural man here becomes the revealed and the gracious God. Here the idol of the natural man becomes the true God; here the heart of God is revealed as that of the one who accepts the sinner unconditionally. Here alone is the God who is a veritable abyss of love and who receives the publicans and sinners and eats with them.

2. This God-for-us, who is in the service revealed to faith, who is in faith experienced and appropriated, is now also revealed as the everywhere present God of creation. It is the same God of love who made the world out of love (*amor dei non invenit sed creat suum diligibilem,* Luther put it) and creation itself is therefore in the service of love and brings men together into community, in the family, the state, the economic order, etc. So the service is after all not bound to specific holy places and holy seasons. This is paganism. But it is bound to the proclamation of the Word. That is why Luther in his explanation of the Third Commandment in the Small Catechism does not even mention the day, but speaks only of joyfully hearing and learning the Word of God. But the Word of God comes to men in various ways (Smalcald Articles), in the sermon, the absolution, the reading of Scripture, the hymns, the sacraments, and the mutual conversation of brethren, wherever the pure Gospel, the Word of forgiveness for Christ's sake, is proclaimed. So in this sense it is bound to time and place. The gracious God is not revealed to natural man everywhere in creation or in the depths of his heart, but only in the proclaimed Christ. Jesus' word to the Samaritan woman (John 4) frees worship from both Jerusalem and Gerizim but binds it to the presence of Christ himself, who alone can give the true water of life.

3. In the service it is also made clear that God always reveals himself through means—in which he is, however, immediately present. The means do not stand as an obstacle between God and man, but they are themselves the bearers of the presence of God. That is the meaning of Luther's "in, with, and under." The holy God never appears to man in his naked glory. No man can see God and live. God dwells in a light which no human eye can penetrate. This holy, hidden God is nevertheless directly present in the *larvae* of creation, through which he gives us all good things. Almost pantheistically Luther speaks of this presence, and yet the dividing line between Creator and creature was for him absolute. And

the same God, who lies thus hidden in the creation and is closer to man than hand or foot, now also uses the flesh of the Son of Man in order to be present in it, without transubstantiation (cf. also the Chalcedonian Christology). In the service, in the Scriptures, in the proclaimed Word, especially in the sacraments, we have this "mediated immediacy" (John Baillie) of the presence of Christ. It is therefore always a hidden presence. That the child in the manger is Immanuel, that the sufferer on the cross is the propitiation for the sins of the world, that the risen Jesus is the victor over the tyrants of death and the devil, was obvious to none of his contemporaries. And that goes also for the service today. That the voice of the preacher in the word of absolution is to be accepted as God's own voice, that here the terrible, judging word of the Law really gives expression to the wrath of God against the sinner, that here, "in, with and under" the bread and wine, the Saviour of sinners really gives himself to men in order to enter into their flesh and blood, is never directly apparent, but always for either faith or offense.

4. If, therefore, the service (and this must come to clear expression in the proclamation of the Word) does not put a man squarely before the decision of either faith or offense, then something is radically wrong. If the service is so conducted that Tom, Dick, and Harry, Jew or Hottentot, can wander in and have a religious experience without being set before the last and final decision, then everything is wrong. If the service is so conducted that the natural man who trusts in himself and in other gods is not struck to the quick in his self-love and self-confidence and idolatry, so that he either beats upon his breast, "God be gracious to me a sinner," and falls to his knees to say, "My Lord and my God," or else sadly sneaks away or indignantly strides out because his heart still clings to his riches (of morality, or of the reason, or of fleshliness), then the Word has not been proclaimed at all. No, the Word with its total claim upon the total man must call to decision. Here there can be no neutrality. This is no mere maneuver. Here the guns are loaded and the shooting is in earnest.

5. So the service is first of all altogether *beneficium,* gift, sacrament, and it occurs in order that a man should now take the salvation that he has there experienced into his daily life and vocation. The direction is first of all from God to men, and then out to other men in serving love in order that everything that God has to offer may serve its proper purpose. So there is in the service no sacrifice which is offered by men to God in propitiation for sin. The sacrifice that covers sin is altogether and completely the sacrifice of God. Nevertheless, there is now also a human sacrifice of praise, of thanks, of prayer, of the whole heart and life in that the old Adam sacrifices himself completely with Christ into his death and the new man is received in the daily rebirth as the miraculous gift of God's grace. But the purpose of this sacrifice is never that God should thereby be appeased, but here man is to be recreated in the image of God which he has

lost. "Naturally" religious men expect God to delight like a human sultan in these bowings and scrapings and "Heil Hitlers," as if he needed this kind of adulation. God is no poor relation who suffers from an inferiority complex and who crawls off into a corner when he is neglected. Just for that reason he is to be honored and praised and all the richness of his gifts is to be passed on to where the real need lies.

6. In summary: The purpose of the service is not only to awaken faith in unbelievers. It is not its purpose, either, to strengthen Christian faith and character through successive infusions of grace. Nor is it restricted to the already redeemed, now joining in songs of praise. Such praise is reserved for the new heaven and the new earth. All these elements must be brought together in a qualitatively different conception of the worshiper who remains *simul justus et peccator,* and of the congregation which remains "hidden." In the service the old Adam, the idol worshiper, is always again to die with Christ and the new man is to arise. This is the right kind of *conformitas Christi* and not that a man should admire and imitate his "wonderful personality." In the service man, therefore, lets himself be served of God and brings his offerings of thanks, praise, prayer, and of his whole body and life. Thereby he is freed for service to his neighbor, and that gracious God who is experienced in the service goes with him into his daily vocation. The service is both witness and confession, all of one piece, seen from the center in Christ.

Baptism already is proclamation and confession. It is altogether the gift of God's grace, and true service of God consists in properly receiving this gift of grace. It is God's action, and as such it stands at the beginning of the life of the child of God. This is the promise: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16). "Repent and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts 2:38). The Christian stands all his life under this sign of grace and must, as Luther expresses it, constantly crawl back to his baptism. (That is why in a Christian home infant baptism is mandatory. There the children should grow up in the assurance that at the beginning of their life, as the children of God, there stands this sovereign act of God's grace. This is true of their physical birth as well as of the rebirth through water and the Holy Ghost.)

But the baptismal act is no mechanical act. God does not just grab a man like a cheese and put him safely away on the shelf of salvation where the mice will not get him. God acts upon me (as Althaus says) only by dealing with me as a person and challenging me to decision. In baptism God has laid his own claim upon me. He also wills to be my God and Lord, and in him alone I am to trust with my whole heart and not in myself and my own works. Here is the right sacrifice, that not only is sin covered, but the old Adam is really destroyed, really hurled into death and nothingness (Rom. 6:4).

The decision before which baptism puts me is whether I will in all humility let God act upon me in this way and thus let myself be taken captive into the true freedom of the children of God, or whether this claim of God upon me will offend me. I am not therefore free to decide for or against God, like the jackass who stands before the pile of straw and the pile of hay and cannot make up his mind. No, my predicament is that I am not free to decide for God, but am free only to go my own ways, to seek my own good, and to trust in myself and other false gods that I can manipulate to suit myself. But in baptism I am taken captive, and in this captivity I am free, and the choice before which I now stand as one baptized is whether in all humility I will consent to what has happened to me, or whether this will anger and offend me, that I really cannot manipulate my own salvation but am altogether dependent upon God's unconditional forgiveness. In this sense baptism puts me before the decision of faith or offense, and if the totalitarian claim of the gracious God upon me offends me, then I remain in my natural idolatry and in the bondage of the tyrants, sin, death, and the devil. Then I am under the wrath of God because now it is clear that he is not my God and that I do not fear, love, and trust in him above all things.

The gracious gift of baptism is therefore not only the death of the old Adam, but we are buried with Christ into his death that "like as he was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Only in this way is the service of God, implicit in baptism, true service of God in the sense of Rom. 12:1 as the new man enters as priest into the service of his neighbor. In this way the proclamation becomes a confession that is not only of the lips but of the heart and the whole life, "living, holy, acceptable unto God." By baptism a man is not only declared righteous but he is made righteous, as Melanchthon indicates. (*Gerechtsprechung ist gleich Gerechtmachung.*) The one who is curved in upon himself and other gods is now made upright and looks up with an open face so that he can properly reflect the image of God in which he was created and receive God's love into himself and thus become a fountain of love to others. He no longer needs to use his energies in order to earn his salvation, but now all his energies can go into the service of his neighbor in his vocation, in the place where God has put him. He no longer uses his neighbor in order through him to earn his salvation, but now he serves his neighbor as a real priest, first of all with the Gospel, with the proclamation of the grace of God, but also by actually forgiving his neighbor and accepting him just as he is, and then serving him in the calling as father, mother, son, daughter, baker, shoemaker, etc.

So baptism is itself true service of God and includes both proclamation and confession. The baptized one confesses his faith before God and men and acclaims the great deeds of God in his creation, redemption, and sanctification. There is no other baptism than the one that incorporates a person into the body of those who continue to proclaim the Gospel and bring it to others. In baptism,

therefore, the true service of God is comprehended. Here the omnipresent God of love (who is, however, hidden from natural man) meets him as the revealed God, the God-for-him, who gives himself to him altogether, who loves him infinitely, contrary to all appearance and probability. And when a man has experienced this God in his baptism, he encounters this same God everywhere. In everything that happens the baptized one sees nothing but sheer love, and he draws upon this ceaseless fountain of love. He has a treasure that no man can take from him. God is his strong fortress and he can sing, "Take they then our life, goods, fame, child, and wife, they yet have nothing won, the kingdom ours remaineth."

And this must not now be forgotten: Baptism makes clear that although I am redeemed and accepted once and for all, yet the old Adam must daily be drowned and die and the new man be awakened. The self-annihilation demanded by baptism must take place every day, and the right service of God and the right trust in God is born only out of the death of self-love. Before the Christian, all his life, there yawns the abyss of the offense, and in the trials of life, when God hides his face, the new man must constantly be reborn by the omnipotent power of love. There is no other helper, and all the gods of the heathen are as sticks and stones.

That is why the baptized Christian also needs the service of the church. There he will again and again, together with others, encounter the gracious God. So the celebration of the sacrament of the altar becomes a true service of God when what once happened in baptism happens again. Let us therefore briefly consider this service too.

You enter the house of God, and the building itself is witness and confession if it is really in accord with the Gospel. Here already it can show itself that art is capable of a proper proclamation of the Gospel. The material is not, as with the Greeks, the seat of evil, but it is itself the vehicle of God. As God's creation it is good, and it is charged with the presence of God. Yet it, too, is held in the bondage of sin and it, too, may become an idol. There is in it no abiding city. It is still on this side of the *parousia.* In the house of worship which is commensurate with the Gospel the *not-yet* and the *nevertheless-already* are dialectically combined. In the house of God both the joy of the Gospel and the *theologia crucis* are to find expression. Some churches are like a morgue; others are so decked out that the Man of Sorrows on the cross is quite incongruous. The soft cushions are far too comfortable. As Peter Brunner says, "Both Isaiah 53, 'He had no form or comeliness,' and Psalm 45, 'He was the fairest among the children of men,' must find expression." The gold cross on the altar can therefore proclaim the right thing. On the other hand, it may be a symbol which really eliminates the awful fact of the crucifixion. Often the cross is only a beautiful ornament on a proud bosom. Then I prefer the crucifix and the horribly distorted Christ of Gruenewald.

If, then, the building itself proclaims the Gospel, there must also be the proper prelude—music that will create the proper mood of worship. But it can also be silence, for in silence reverence before the Holy comes to clearest expression. But when one begins to speak of a sacrament of silence, then a halt must be called. If you go with your sins into absolute silence, how shall you find peace if there is no one to call into that awful silence? A man may also sit in this silence in false security until the voice of thunder resounds in it. Yes, you must keep silent, you must hold still, in order to hear God's Word.

So you sing the opening hymn:

> God Himself is present, let us now adore him
> And with awe appear before him.
> God is in his temple, all within keep silence,
> Prostrate lie in deepest reverence.

Here true worship begins, here is a real offering of praise, when the worshiper humbles himself utterly before God and puts himself at his disposal.

Then the service begins in the name of the triune God, a riddle for those to whom God's great deeds have never been proclaimed, foolishness to the Greeks who seek for wisdom, a stumbling block to those who seek for a sign, but to those who are called it is the power of God and the wisdom of God. That is why in this name the whole message and confession of the church are already contained. Those who are gathered here in this name are the *ekklesia;* they are those who have been called out of darkness into marvelous light; they are the body of Christ in the power of the Holy Spirit; they are in living communion with the risen Christ. But they are hidden. God alone knows his own. No one can make himself known before the world as a Christian by means of a certain sign, except his confession. The sign of the church is, therefore, this Name, this proclamation, this confession, that God in Jesus Christ in the power of the Holy Spirit here gives himself to men for their redemption and receives them into fellowship.

Then follows the confession of sins with which every service must begin. This is the right confession, which at the same time (as already indicated by the word *homologein*) declares God's praises, for God is only properly praised when man throws himself unconditionally upon his grace. Step for step this is right: "Our help is in the name of the Lord, who made heaven and earth." The God who forgives is none other than the Creator of heaven and earth. Before this Creator and Redeemer, before his saving righteousness, we are guilty and condemned. We cast ourselves upon his mercy and not only ask for forgiveness but for power to become the sons of God and to do his will and really to have faith and to love.

Then follows the absolution, the epitome of the Gospel: "Where there is

forgiveness of sins, there is life and salvation." "Whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Whoever puts the old Adam to death with Christ shall also be raised with him to a new life. Only in this way can the freed sinner now join in the service of God.

But how easy it is to misunderstand! How tough is the pride of natural man! People yawn during the confession of sins. You should not take it so seriously or you will spoil all your fun! Some think that they merit forgiveness by means of their confession because of the copiousness of their tears. Some think only of individual acts of transgression because now and then they fell short of the highest, and they do not see that they *are* sinners in the depths of their being. The exhortation which is used at the celebration of the sacrament says it still more clearly: "If we thus examine ourselves (as St. Paul exhorteth us) we shall find in us nothing but sin and death, from which we can in no wise set ourselves free." Here already the decision is made. Actually nothing but sin and death? Here a man must make his decision and here the ways part. Either faith or offense. *Tertium non datur.*

After the absolution follows the introit. The pastor first goes up to the altar (the *introibo ad altarem dei, ad deum qui laetificat iuventutem meum*), but not in the Roman Catholic fashion in order that the priest may bring an offering of propitiation for sin, but in order that the redeemed sinner may now bring his sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving after having received forgiveness.

The Introitus is itself a declaration of grace, and then in alternating rhythm there follows the Kyrie. This is followed by the Gloria in excelsis, where once more the great deeds of God are proclaimed and confessed. The salutation, which begins the next part, consists of a mutual intercession of pastor and people. Loehe says of it: "The bond of love and of unity between pastor and congregation is renewed."

In the collect for the day the heart is then to be prepared for the reading of Epistle and Gospel. How appropriate, for example, is the collect for Christmas Eve: "O God, who hast made this most holy night to shine with the brightness of the true Light: Grant, we beseech Thee, that as we have known on earth the mysteries of that Light, we may also come to the fullness of His joys in heaven."

Then follow Epistle and Gradual. This is genuine proclamation of the Word, and we can depend upon it that in the course of the church year all God's great deeds, both the Law and the Gospel, will be proclaimed through the lessons. But even here we must, in my opinion, not be slavishly bound. Of course, no pastor should take arbitrary liberties to suit himself. But the church of Jesus Christ must retain the freedom, also in this respect, to proclaim the Word to a particular day and hour. That is why Epistle and Gospel should be read in the language of the day and not in the antiquated language of the King James version. Everything depends upon simple, clear proclamation of the Word that is understood,

and refuge cannot be taken in the fact that the liturgy is poetry or that it is to lead a mystical experience.

Then follows the credo. The Creed consists of man's words, originating at the time and place, in order to distinguish Christians in their faith from others. Everything depends, therefore, upon how the Creed is understood. Here the great importance of the whole context in which the Creed stands becomes important. Catholics and Lutherans and others recite the same Creed, and yet it is not the same. We need only refer to Luther's explanation of the three articles to clinch the point. According to Luther, none can confess God as Creator who has not been taken hold of by the God of love and grace, who does not receive everything that he is and has as a gift of grace, and who therefore does not feel himself constrained "to thank and praise, serve and obey him." The direction of true worship is always the same: Reception of God's gifts of grace in order then to serve out of gratitude in the same love. The same thing comes to even clearer expression in the other articles: "In order that I might be his own, live under him in his kingdom, and serve him in everlasting righteousness, innocence, and blessedness."

Then follows the sermon, prepared for by a hymn, and at this point I merely want to repeat the main thesis, that everything depends upon the living proclamation of the Word. Only by means of the sermon did the church come into being on the first Pentecost. There we have the sign that the saving Gospel was understood by each in his own tongue. So there is no language in the world in which God's great deeds cannot be proclaimed and understood in the power of the Holy Spirit, because it is a matter of the transformation of existence. This cannot be said of philosophy, because people think differently in different parts of the world. Music is called the universal language of man, but this is not so because tastes vary and what is pleasing to one is an abomination to another. Music, unaccompanied by words, can never proclaim the Gospel and call to decision. The proclamation of the Word is different because in each case it addresses man in his existence; this does not change through the years, and it is the same in all parts of the world. The concern is not for a philosophy of life, but for a rebirth of the entire man in his existence. Idolatry, self-love, pride, self-centeredness, hatred, envy, jealousy, fear, dread, etc.—these are in all places and at all times the same, and each man must be confronted by the living Christ as both his Brother and his Lord, as true Man and true God, so that he may acknowledge himself as sinner before him and find in him his Saviour. The sermon must call to repentance, not only on the mission field, but also within the congregation, because it is only through daily sorrow and repentance that a man remains a Christian. But it must also describe the new life of the Christian in terms of the contemporary situation and must always properly distinguish between the Law and the Gospel. According to I Cor. 14 the sermon must always be for edification,

and speaking with tongues has no proper place in the public meeting, and therefore not in the liturgy either. The worshiper is not to be put into an ecstasy or simply to wallow in pleasant emotions. The sermon is to call to obedience and to battle. Nevertheless, we must not forget that Jesus spoke in parables, "in order that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand" (Mark 4:12). The proclamation must always be such that the preacher realizes that his skill as an orator is not what counts, and that no man can confess that Jesus is Lord except by the Holy Ghost. Faith is not a human decision of the will to which a man can force himself. The living Christ must draw a man with cords of love (Hosea 11:4). "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto myself" (John 12:32).

After the sermon follows the offertory and the money gifts of the congregation are collected. Luther did away with this offering because people thought that they were buying merits by means of it and because the money went to lazy priests for the reading of masses, etc. Rightly understood, the fruits of the service are to consist in the love which serves the neighbor in his need. If offerings are now laid upon the altar, they are to be put there in exactly the same spirit in which Christ laid himself upon the altar for the good of man. The offering of money is to be only a token of the living sacrifice of the whole of life which now serves the neighbor in love. Here the intimate relation between the work of creation and of redemption finds expression. Man is recreated in the image of God, which he had lost, in order that he may serve the Creator in his creation according to the law of creation, which is love, and in order to build the right life-together-in-love in his daily vocation. As Luther says (cited by Vajta): "The Word (together with the sacraments) is the window through which God reveals himself to us as the one who has redeemed us *in* the creation and *for* the creation." But because man is so prone to fall into self-righteousness precisely when he offers his gifts, the offertory must be understood: "Create in me, God, a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within me."

Then comes the prayer of the church which will reveal whether or not the heart is right. Is this the *homo religiosus* speaking, or is it the child of God? Is this the child speaking with his heavenly Father in the midst of the congregation, or is this the isolated individual shut up within himself. Or is this the heathen trying to prevail upon God with his much speaking? Confession of sin, offerings of thanks and praise, petition and intercession for the brethren, for all men, "as dear children ask of their dear father" in the confidence that he will hear them. None is excluded; the prayer is as wide as the heart of God.

The celebration of the sacrament itself follows. Nothing is to be foreshortened here. Here is the congregation and the body of Christ. Everything that Luther says about the divine service is transacted here. We can and must say that the sacrament is the seal of forgiveness and the individualization of the Word. In

he "for you" of the individual application each one is given assurance, tangible, personal, intimate. And yet there is something else. If only the awful fact is proclaimed that here the risen Lord is really sitting at table with his own, how should this not become a source of the greatest temptation? How shall this strengthen a weak and wavering faith that here, "in, with, and under" the bread and wine, the body that was given and the blood that was shed for me is now to enter into my very flesh and blood? Here we stand before the great either-or, either faith or offense. This is not just a reminder of a dead hero; this is not raising yourself on the wings of faith into the divine presence; this is not just another rung up the ladder to the beatific vision. This is the encounter with God here and now upon this earth. Down the Jacob's ladder the Saviour descends to this earth, and here he meets the fugitive, the child of promise, who is not ready to wait patiently upon God but wants to control his own destiny—and now God accepts him nevertheless and sends him on his way to fulfill his vocation upon this earth.

Nothing is to be detracted from the *unio sacramentalis,* the *manducatio oralis,* the *communio indignorum* which have characterized the Lutheran view in the past. The sacrament is neither transubstantiation nor consubstantiation, but it is the repeated coming of the Lord in the "mediated immediacy" of earthly elements, "in, with, and under" the bread and wine, in order that we may then feel the presence of the same God in the bread and wine of daily life.

It is not just a so-called spiritual experience, but this Saviour is to enter into flesh and blood. Whether I believe it or not, there is this terrible presence, and then if I do not acknowledge this, if I do not bow before it, how should it then not be a judgment upon me! It is not just the spirit of the Lord, but it is his spiritual-bodily presence: *finitum est capax infiniti,* and everything that implies for our earthly existence.

Everything that could be said must now be comprehended in the words of the apostle, "For as oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death, till he come." Here we stand between the two advents. But not alone, not dependent upon ourselves, for he is with us who once sat at table with his disciples and now invites us to be his guests; with him we shall some day sit together at the heavenly banquet tables. Only so can you live, only so can you die, with this Shepherd at your side, who leads you to the green pastures and beside the still waters and goes with you through the valley of the shadow.

Now, in conclusion, just a few words about freedom in worship. We dare not reverse Article VII of the Augsburg Confession. The important thing is the *"recte docetur"* and the *"recte administrantur"*—that the Gospel be really proclaimed and the sacraments so administered that nothing contradicts the Gospel. So there must be freedom with respect to ceremonies instituted by men, while nevertheless it is recognized that such ceremonies are never *adiaphora* insofar as the Gospel is concerned. The Papists as well as the Enthusiasts were slaves of

the law and of human works. So there must be freedom under the Gospel. The architect, the sculptor, the composer of the twentieth century, in the East as well as the West, in Germany, America, China, India, Africa, must have freedom to give expression to the message and the confession of the church in accordance with the needs of time and place. But only if a man really believes this message and only if the confession is his own, will he succeed in doing this. In unbelief all art is nothing but egocentric self-assertion, a tower of Babel, an idol erected to the glory of man and not of God. If a man seeks for salvation in the works of his own hands, then, as Peter Brunner says, he has "made the forbidden image that by the power of magic is supposed to give back to man the fullness of his lost being" (*Leitourgia,* p. 308). In the service, God alone is to be given the glory, and his totalitarian claim is to be acknowledged and given expression. Creations can become transparent with the preaching of the Gospel, but they are not in themselves aids. They remain the long, long finger of the preacher in the wilderness which points to the One in whom alone there is help. He alone is King of kings and Lord of lords, and before him alone every knee is to bow and every tongue confess that he is Lord to the glory of the Father. It is always the time of decision, and the hour-glass is running down. As Kierkegaard said over a hundred years ago, we cannot wait until the long-awaited song-book at last appears or until "the System" is finally finished. We must in this hour proclaim the saving Gospel and must confess it with our lives, and everyone in his station must be a Christ to his neighbor. That is real service of God.

Life and Thought in World Lutheranism

European Views of Lutheran Church Life in America

It is often illuminating to see ourselves as others see us. Since the close of World War II a considerable number of European churchmen have visited North America for the purpose of observing our church life, and on their return to their home countries they have often given extended oral accounts of their impressions. Not a few of these have been published in the form of articles or even books. On the whole the observations which are made betray more understanding and discernment than was customary in the case of visitors to our shores after World War I. Of the earlier reports one of the best known is Hermann Werdermann's *Das religiöse Angesicht Amerikas* (Gütersloh, 1926). Among the more recent reports there is a collection of letters by German exchange students assembled by Paul Collmer under the title *Länder, Menschen, Universitäten* (Stuttgart, 1950). A more unified picture is offered by Johannes Pfeiffer in his *Auf Luthers Spuren in Amerika* (Berlin, 1952).

Pfeiffer reports that he was astonished to discover how well the name of Luther is known in America. Often, however, he found this knowledge to be nominal in the strict sense; the name of Luther is generally familiar, but not always his understanding of the Gospel and Christian life. Outwardly, other than Lutheran influences are observable. The vestments of Lutheran clergymen tend to follow Anglican models. "Widespread in America is the belief—not to say the superstition—that Gothic is the truly 'Christian' style of architecture, . . . and most of the older Lutheran churches were built in the dubious and artificial neo-Gothic of the nineteenth century. More recently English Gothic has been preferred, and often quite showy but at bottom equally unsatisfactory imitations have been built. Surprisingly, really modern church buildings, in which the attempt is made to discover a new style, are seldom encountered in America" (pp. 84, 85).

"In America Martin Luther has for the most part forgotten how to sing his own chorales. Not that the hymnals do not include hymns of Martin Luther, Paul Gerhardt, and other great hymn writers of our church. . . . But in so far as the chorales are sung at all (and it is said that this occurs more often than formerly), they are sung in a lifeless fashion to a comparatively listless organ accompaniment. How different it is when a congregation sings the 'sweet' melodies of nineteenth century English hymns to the accompaniment of the sentimental tremulos of the beloved electric organ! There is one German hymn which I heard again and again—preferably sung fervently by rough men's voices or the loud voices of young people. This is 'Beautiful Saviour,' a hymn which we generally allow, for the sake of the little ones, only in children's services. Cor-

responding to 'Beautiful Saviour' is the similarly 'sweet' and 'beautiful' head of Christ by the American artist Warner Sallmann, copies of which hang on the walls of almost every Lutheran church, sacristy, office, and parsonage. . . . Here the inroads of typical 'American' and un-Lutheran piety are clearly discernible all along the line. . . . On the other hand, it is a great enrichment (in the estimation of a German too) that Scandinavian hymns are sung in church services—a consequence of the influence of Lutheran churches of North European provenance. Included among such hymns are not only old Nordic chorales but also new words and melodies. It is as pleasing as it is surprising for a German Lutheran to discover Lutheran hymns set to the music of Edvard Grieg and Jan Sibelius" (pp. 86-88).

"In America the place of women in the church means, first of all, something genuinely feminine: women in the kitchen! It is not true (as we often mistakenly suppose) that the American housewife seldom cooks and dislikes to cook. . . . And so in every church one is proudly shown a roomy kitchen as modernly appointed as possible, in which the women of the church prepare meals for all sorts of occasions" (pp. 91, 92). Women are also active in American Lutheran churches as speakers, teachers, counselors, and deaconesses, but never as ordained ministers. "Here they remain faithful to the biblical injunction that they remain silent in the church—that is, in public worship. . . . It was a false understanding of the congregation which made it possible for us [in Europe] to introduce female vicars. In America, on the contrary, the examples of a predominantly radical Protestant environment has contributed to guard the Lutheran Church against this unfortunate development" (p. 98).

Whether this interesting reason accounts for the absence of women preachers in the Lutheran Church in North America is doubtful, but the fact remains that while Presbyterians are debating the admissibility of women to ordination, the issue has hardly stirred a ripple among Lutherans—at least up to the year of our Lord 1956.

A New International Journal of Lutheran Theology

During the year 1955 an important new theological journal made its appearance under the name *Kerygma und Dogma*. Published in Göttingen by the reputable firm of Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, the quarterly journal reflects the fellowship of thought which has developed since World War II among the younger Lutheran theologians in Germany, Scandinavia, and other countries. The editors are Edmund Schlink, of Heidelberg, Regin Prenter, of Aarhus in Denmark, and Gerhard Gloege, of Jena in the eastern zone of Germany. Additional members of the staff include such men as N. A. Dahl, of Norway; A. Lauha, of Finland; G. Wingren, of Sweden; K. E. Skydsgaard, of Denmark; Oscar Cullmann, of Switzerland; Ernst Kinder, of Germany.

Participants in the new venture are agreed that the cultivation of theology is a necessary function of the church and that it serves the proclamation of the Gospel. "Just as efforts to understand the Gospel never cease, so con-

cern for pure doctrine which expresses such understanding can never cease. The task confronting theology cannot be achieved by merely quoting the Creeds of the ancient church and the Confession of the Lutheran Reformation, for these demand constant historical, scriptural, and systematic interpretation. Moreover, the criticism of other communions must be heard and their witness must be weighed and considered." It is not a spirit of confessional narrowness or self-sufficiency that animates this venture, therefore, but rather a spirit of earnest theological inquiry which acknowledges its responsibility to the church and its honest attachment to the Lutheran Confessions. Much may be expected of this journal, and a small token of its revelance to America as well as Europe may be suggested by the following paragraph from Regin Prenter's article, "The Augsburg Confession and the Roman Catholic Sacrifice of the Mass," in Vol. I, No. 1, pp. 52, 53.

"When in the *Catechismus Romanus* it is expressly stated that the sacrifice of the mass is not merely a 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' and not merely an anamnesis (*nuda commemoratio*) of the sacrifice on the cross, but is at the same time a propitiatory sacrifice whereby God is made gracious, everything that was previously asserted about the identity of the sacrifice on the cross with the sacrifice of the mass is nullified. For a sacrifice which is not merely a 'sacrifice of thanksgiving' but is at the same time a sacrifice by which God is made gracious no longer is a 'sacrifice of thanksgiving' at all. The moment that God is represented as unreconciled, and even as demanding new expiation, thanksgiving for the accomplished atonement by the sacrifice on the cross ceases. This is the temptation of the devil, who tries to silence the Gospel of the atonement which has already been accomplished. But the Gospel itself knows no unreconciled God. Consequently the Gospel and thanksgiving belong together. It is of the nature of thanksgiving that it can be *only* thanksgiving, for it glorifies the unlimited fullness of divine grace which the Gospel proclaims. Accordingly the thanksgiving of the congregation can never be propitiatory sacrifice *as well as* 'sacrifice of thanksgiving.' For as soon as one prevents thanksgiving from being everything, it ceases to be thanksgiving at all and becomes a supplication for what is still wanting. If there is to be a continual thanksgiving in the congregation, the atoning sacrifice must have been offered once for all so that no additional propitiation is required but only the communication of the forgiveness of sins on the basis of the reconciliation which has already taken place. If one concedes the presupposition that propitiation is still wanting, thanksgiving is destroyed."

Lutherans in North America who read German (or wish to brush up on a rusty knowledge of German) and who are really concerned about the relation which the church's preaching has to the church's teaching will find in *Kerygma und Dogma* (subscription 9.80 DM a year) a welcome supplement to *The Lutheran World* (subscription $1.75 a year) and *The Lutheran Quarterly* (subscription $2.75 a year).

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

THE YONAN CODEX

In recent weeks a bus called the "Spirit of Galilee" has been carrying around the country a Syriac Codex of the New Testament which is claimed to be the oldest known New Testament in "Aramaic," the language used by our Lord and his disciples. The aim of the tour is to raise funds for the purchase of the codex for the Library of Congress, the production of facsimiles, translation of the codex, and the establishing of research professorships. The whole project, as reported in the Washington *Evening Star* of March 25, 1955, has since been widely publicized.

Because of the exaggerated claims of the group sponsoring the project and because numerous requests for information on the codex have reached the writer, he herewith presents the following statement, adopted by the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis at its meeting in New York last December. (For further discussion see *The Christian Century,* January 11, 1956, p. 53, col. 3.)

"The Society of Biblical Literature at its annual meeting in New York City on December 28-30, 1955, wishes to go on record as opposing some of the publicity attending the efforts currently being made to raise by popular subscription $1,500,000 for the purchase of the so-called Yonan Codex. This codex is a manuscript of the Syriac New Testament which is reported to be 'the oldest surviving complete New Testament written in Syriac-Aramaic, the language spoken by Jesus' (Washington *Evening Star,* March 25, 1955).

"According to members of our Society who have examined the manuscript, the Yonan Codex is a copy of the Syriac Peshitta, a version which was made from the Greek New Testament at about the beginning of the fifth century and which contains twenty-two of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament. Edessene Syriac, the language of this version, differs considerably from the Palestinian Aramaic used by Jesus more than four centuries earlier. About three hundred manuscripts of the Peshitta version are known to exist in the libraries of this country and Europe. Several of these are older than the Yonan Codex, which some of our members who are expert in Syriac paleography date in the seventh or eighth century. According to certain members of the Society who have frequently arranged for the purchase of biblical manuscripts, a fair estimate of the value of a manuscript like the Yonan Codex is about $5,000."

In this connection it may be in order to present a brief statement on the Syriac manuscripts of the Bible. The oldest version of the Old Testament is the Peshitta (simple), which dates from the second or third centuries A.D. and was translated from the Hebrew. Another Syriac translation was made by Philoxenus at the beginning of the sixth century, and a third by Paul of Tella about a century later.

According to T. H. Robinson (*The Bible in Its Ancient and English Versions,* ed. by H. W. Robinson, p. 90) the following situation pertains to the New Testament:

1. The Old Syriac limited to the Gospels,

2. The Peshitta traditionally ascribed to Rabbula about the fourth century,
3. The version of Philoxenus (see above),
4. The Harkleian version corresponding to Paul of Tella's Old Testament, and from the same period.

Of (1) we have only two manuscripts. Of (2) 243 manuscripts were counted by Kenyon (*Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts,* p. 164). More are known now. Of (4), in general a revision of (3), about 50 manuscripts are known, the best one copied in A.D. 1170 from a seventh century manuscript. Of (3) only a few portions of the New Testament are known (the four minor Catholic Epistles and a copy of Revelation). Apart from these there are fragments of another version, known as the Palestinian Syriac, which dates from the sixth century, A.D.

J. M. Myers

Book Reviews and Notices[1]

Luther's Works. Vol. 12: Selected Psalms, I. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955. 418 pages. $5.

Several years have gone into the planning of a 55-volume edition of Luther's works in English translation, the first volume of which (the twelfth of the planned series) is now published. Thirty of the volumes are to be devoted to Luther's commentaries, lectures, sermons, and other treatments of large segments of Old and New Testaments, and the remaining twenty-five volumes are to be given to the translation of his major tracts, treatises, table talks, and other writings. The former are under the editorial supervision of Professor Jaroslav Pelikan and will be published by the Concordia Publishing House, while the latter are under the editorial supervision of Dr. Helmut Lehmann and will be published by the Muhlenberg Press. Individual pieces in these volumes will be translated by dozens of scholars whose competence has been or will be tested, and this community of study is in keeping with Luther's dictum, "A translator should not be alone, for where two or three are gathered together, etc." (*WA, TR,* I, No. 961). Notable, too, is the cooperative character of this venture, which will enlist the aid of scholars in all major Lutheran bodies in North America and will employ the resources of two large publishing houses.

Of course, this is not the first time that an attempt has been made to put Luther into English. (The major earlier translations and their limitations are discussed in *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* XIX (Oct., 1946), pp. 411-417.) But never before has the time been so opportune as the present for translation on such an ambitious scale. On the one hand, critical texts of the originals are now available as they were not before, and our knowledge of the context in which Luther wrote and the peculiarities of the languages (Latin and German) which he employed is greater. On the other hand, the theological climate of today is more receptive to Luther's understanding of the Gospel, both within the Lutheran Church and without, than it has been for at least a century. The tools and the appreciation are at hand, giving promise of superior translations.

The volume before us now is one of several to appear on the Psalms, one of Luther's favorite parts of the Bible. As the editor reminds us in a brief introduction, no matter whether Luther was lecturing on a portion of the Bible, preaching in a church, or offering an informal exposition in domestic devotions, his procedure was comparatively uniform: exegesis was accompanied by admonition and application. The reader of this volume will make additional observations. The importance of the Psalms lay for Luther in the testimony to Christ and the Gospel which he claimed to find in them, and behind this was the conviction that the Psalms were to be read in the light of the testimony of the New Testament. Striking, too, is the contemporaneity which the biblical witness had for the Reformer. Hence the Psalms become vehicles for a discussion of monks and bishops, rulers and popes, Anabaptists and Turks, the invocation of saints and the use of the sacraments. It also deserves to be noted that, even in later years, Luther did not claim to have understood everything in the Scriptures. Of Psalm 51 he could say, "I admit that I have not fully grasped the Spirit who speaks there" (p. 303), and with respect to the meaning of a particular Hebrew word he could say, "We, too, are uncertain of our opinion" (p. 199). Nevertheless, the underlying message was evident to him, and he often summed this up in crisp statements—for example, "We are not sinners because we commit this or that sin, but we commit them because we are sinners first" (p. 348).

---

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

The translations in the present volume were done by Lewis W. Spitz, Jr., assistant professor of History in the University of Missouri, Walther M. Miller, professor of German in Valparaiso University, Ernest B. Koenker, professor of Religion in the same school, and the editor, who is associate professor of Historical Theology in the University of Chicago. Their work has been done with great faithfulness and skill. The English is easy, flowing, and idiomatic. It succeeds in a high measure in capturing the changing moods reflected in the originals, and this is the ultimate test of good translation. The format, typography, binding, and stamping are handsomely done.

To buy fifty-five volumes of Luther at one throw and place them on our shelves at once would, for most of us, have a twofold effect. It would bankrupt us, and the books would seldom be disturbed because the set would appear so formidable as to discourage reading. It is therefore an uncommon advantage to buy and read these books as they appear from the press—two volumes in 1956 and four in each succeeding year until the set is complete. This will distribute the cost over many years, and no one can honestly say that he lacks the time to read four volumes a year. Moreover, the publishers are offering a 10 per cent discount for those who place standing orders. Here, then, is an opportunity which should be seriously weighed by every Lutheran minister. The future of his ministry and the future of the church itself may well be shaped by the extent to which Luther is read and inwardly digested in our generation.

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. Vol. III. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954. 1198 pages.

Most everyone is now familiar with the structure of the *Interpreter's Bible* and Vol. III follows the same plan. It contains the text, King James and RSV of Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and Job together with the Exegete's and Expositor's notes. Each book is preceded by a very complete outline and introduction discussing the source, method, purpose, historicity, and authorship of each book. There is also a great deal of valuable background historical material contained in this Introduction.

Norman H. Snaith writes the introduction and the exegesis of both First and Second Kings; Ralph W. Sockman the exposition of First Kings and Raymond Calkins of Second Kings. Snaith does for the most part what I feel is an excellent job in spite of getting frequently and tediously bogged down with JEDP. This may be fine for the classroom but it serves little worthwhile purpose on the parish level for either Bible study or sermons. On the other hand Snaith has some very fine material on word studies and is not afraid to tackle some of the more obscure passages which so many commentaries fail to do. Snaith also has a way of giving a good modern equivalent to old terms: II Kings 17:9 "from the tower of the watchmen to the fenced city," i.e., "from shack to mansion."

In his exposition Sockman has more material than Calkins but not necessarily better. In fact his frequent refrain of "being true to one's self," may well be disturbing to Lutheran readers. On the whole his material is perhaps more adaptable to Bible study than it is to homiletics but it cannot be said that there is not a wealth of preaching ideas with both these men. Calkins is particularly good on the account of Naaman, ". . . if we can but forget our pride and put off our intellectual harness and critical apparatus, and go right down into the stream of the life-giving life of God, then our flesh too will come to us as the flesh of a little child." In II Kings 6:8-17 "the horses and chariots of fire," he is outstanding.

In First and Second Chronicles W. A. L. Elmslie gives both the exegesis and exposition. Most of us have seldom if ever preached on these two books but Elmslie in his exposition makes it possible to do just that. Chronicles, he says, is one of the most stimulating books in the Bible and he does a good job of making it so. He does not treat it as an accurate history of Judah but rather a Hebraic philosophy of history presented on an immense scale. Treated in any other way, he says, it becomes the deadwood that we so often have let it become. A quote will

perhaps make his purpose more clear. "The Jews for whom the Chronicler wrote were shrewd men. Moreover, they could, if they chose, compare Chronicles with the plain text in Samuel and Kings. Obviously the Chronicler expected his readers to look beneath the surface and to perceive a deeper purpose than the attempt to write an accurate account of the past. It was easy for the Chronicler's contemporaries to see what he really meant, however difficult for us."

The books of Ezra and Nehemiah are treated as one unit as they are in the oldest Hebrew codices. The Introduction and Exegesis are handled by Raymond A. Bowman and the Exposition by Charles W. Gilkey. Authorship of the two books is ascribed to the anonymous Chronicler which of course is quite common. Bowman says that the author of Ezra does not have as his primary aim historical reconstruction but rather the maintenance and enrichment of the Temple ritual. He uses his scanty material to write what we call "idealized history," but it cannot be too strongly emphasized that in all this there was no conscious falsification on the author's part. Lutherans might find some of this rather hard to go along with, but it would be hard to find as abundant a supply of exegetical material on these two books as is found in this commentary. The expository material, however, is quite limited and would help mostly with Bible study.

Bernhard W. Anderson, Dean of Drew Theological Seminary, wrote the Introduction and the Exegesis for the Book of Esther and Arthur C. Lichtenberger the Exposition. Anderson takes the point of view that the governing purpose of the book of Esther is to explain and justify the celebration of a festival for which there is no basis in the Law. He tries to steer the middle path in the problem of historicity and thus holds the opinion that it is more or less a historical novel, like those of Scott, having a nucleus of historical truth that has been imaginatively embellished. Anderson stands very firmly on the canonicity of the book of Esther saying that "from the perspective of the New Testament this book has an indispensable place in the record of the providential working of God in Israel's history." Lichtenberger's exegesis is as good and as complete as I have ever seen on this book. Anderson has enough material in his exposition to offer many a suggestion to a man desiring to preach on the Book of Esther. I myself have never felt any motivation to preach on this book but this commentary might persuade me.

The Introduction and Exegesis of the book of Job is written by Samuel Terrien and the Exposition by Paul Scherer. Terrien has an introduction that is much more than that; it is virtually a commentary itself on the book of Job. Some may not agree with his points of view on authorship (dual—prose writer and poet) or his origin of the book in Edomitic Wisdom literature but it would be hard to refute his arguments on the purpose of the book, i.e., not to answer the question "Why do the righteous suffer?" but rather "What is the meaning of faith . . . how can a man be just before God?" To find the exegesis and the exposition in almost complete agreement is as strange as it is rewarding and that is the case with this book. Scherer has an abundance of good homiletical material in his exposition which we would expect from a man of his preaching stature.

The commentary on Job is a fitting close to a book that is well worthwhile on any pastor's bookshelf.

H. Peder Waldum

The Growth of the Pentateuch. By Immanuel Lewy. New York: Bookman Associates, 1955. 288 pages. $4.

The book consists of five long chapters, a series of appendices, a preface, and an introduction by Prof. R. H. Pfeiffer of Harvard. It is in essence a new approach to the problem of Pentateuchal origins which are here sociologically oriented and represents a combination of the old literary and modern biographical methods with significant results. The fundamental thesis of the author, in agreement with biblical tradition, is that the Torah is presupposed in the prophets rather than that the prophetic pronouncements themselves were responsible for Torah morality, as the Wellhausen school insisted. Virtually all of the Pentateuch is therefore pre-exilic.

In developing his argument, Dr. Lewy begins at the end of the long period of the growth of the Pentateuch. His first chapter deals with the late seventh century materials which he denominates the Priestly Code. Then he treats the Deuteronomic legislation which he thinks comes from the eighth century. Antedating the Deuteronomic Code were a series of northern and southern annotators who worked with a basic document produced by the "Tenth Century Master Narrator" thought to be Nathan, the prophet (N). Behind N stands the work of Samuel who was responsible for the Covenant Code (Exodus 20:20-23:19) and the work of Moses who gave us a Penal Code (Exodus 21:12, 15-17, 23b-25; 22:17-19).

According to the author, the Pentateuchal formation proceeded in certain well-defined stages. First there was a kind of proto-Pentateuch brought together by Nathan and composed of Mosaic and Samuelic elements plus the humanitarian sections usually ascribed to J (pp. 187-189). Nathan's book was then taken over by the priests (Abiathar and Zadok) and revised forming substantially the J element of the critics. Thus N + Jp = J. Then came the prophetic school represented by Elisha who annotated J. That work represents basically northern E materials and northern Deuteronomic materials. In the south the priestly annotation of J (Pn) was carried through by Jehoiada. Following the fall of the Northern Kingdom, the religious documents produced there were brought to Jerusalem where the Hezekian editors combined those legal materials with their own into an expanded "Jerusalemite Deuteronomy." Late in the seventh century Hilkiah further annotated the preceding work with the "Jerusalem Priestly Code." The post-exilic sections (Leviticus 26:34-35, 40-45; Numbers 24:23-24; Deuteronomy 4:25-31; 30:1-10) were added by the high priest Joshua about 520 B.C.

The detailed arguments by which the author attempts to justify his theory cannot be given here but they are quite forcefully presented and rather carefully worked out. The problem, however, remains as to whether the facts of Pentateuchal composition can be explained more adequately by the theory of consecutive annotations than by the regnant documentary theory. The most cogent elements in the Lewy hypothesis are its sociological and biographical features which must be reckoned with by all subsequent studies dealing with the formation of the Pentateuch. Despite the exalted position assigned to Moses in this scheme, the reviewer feels that the persistent tradition of the substantial Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch has not been sufficiently accounted for. Here is a book that deserves careful consideration by all Old Testament scholars.

J. M. MYERS

Christ the Conqueror, Ideas of Conflict and Victory in the New Testament. By Ragnar Leivestad. London: S.P.C.K., 1954. 320 pages.

The author of the book is a thirty-nine year old Norwegian theologian known up to this time by his articles in Scandinavian theological periodicals. He styles himself in most respects a disciple of Sigmund Mowinckel and Lyder Brun, his teachers at the University of Oslo. From 1940 to 1951 he carried out graduate studies in the Old Testament and the New Testament. He has also studied at St. Andrews and Uppsala. At present he is Chaplain in Aus, Norway.

For the rediscovery of the motif of conflict in modern theology, we are indebted to the work of A. Seeberg, G. Aulen, and E. Stauffer, among others. The value of Leivestad's investigation lies in the comprehensive character of his exegetical study of this theme.

He begins with a survey of conflict and victory in Jewish eschatology starting from the work of Friedrichsen on the warlike features of the Old Testament picture of God (Jahwe als Krieger). He discusses the Jewish messianic expectations under the three headings of the warlike "Son of David"; the celestial conqueror, "The Son of Man"; and the moral conqueror, "The Son of Levi."

Two-thirds of the book is devoted to the exegesis of pertinent passages in the New Testament. It is impossible to comment adequately on the wealth of material and the breadth of scholarship herein displayed. This exegetical effort broadens the basis of the

victory ideas in the New Testament. For instance, in dealing with the conflict of Jesus with the demons, his investigations show this feature of the ministry of Jesus is presented by the Synoptists as a part of the victory of God that is independent of the victory motif of the death of Jesus. In a similar way the temptations of Jesus are handled in a most enlightening way—not simply as the inner struggles of a man, but as part of the messianic struggle and victory over the forces of evil. Thus the victory ideas are seen to have a role in the history of the Old Testament, the ministry of Jesus, his death, and the function of the church in the present time between his ascension and resurrection.

The agreement between Aulen and Leivestad, while reaching rather far, is not without a sharp difference. Aulen argues from the history of doctrine, Leivestad from an exegesis of the New Testament. As a result of his exegetical method he objects strongly to Aulen's wholly negative view of the law, which he links with the powers of evil that are defeated by the death of Christ. In a similar manner, Leivestad does not follow Aulen in pitting the sacrificial work of Christ in direct opposition to the victory motif. This is a step in the right direction, although it is disappointing to see that in his exegetical treatment of sacrifice he overlooks passages like Romans 3:25. Finally, as has been shown, he opposes Aulen's narrowing down of the victory motif to the dramatic view of the death of Christ. In this criticism one can agree, and yet it is difficult to see just how seriously Leivestad has taken this particular motif in his own synthesis.

Leivestad likes to class all references to the powers of evil as metaphorical and moral, not metaphysical. His view is that the work of Jesus was couched in the traditional conceptions of Messiah which were somewhat altered to fit his person, but that the alteration was not perfectly accomplished. In the chapter, "Mythos and Ethos," the myth is played down for the ethical view of victory. The conflict is "a moral one throughout" (p. 300). This reviewer would feel that the conflict is in the end not so much a "moral" victory as a personal victory. Leivestad begins his study by assuming the radically personal note of God as warrior and the Old Testament as "The Book of the Wars of the Lord" (Numbers 21:14), and he ends his study with a chapter. "Caritas vincet omnis," in praise of the principle of love. If this progression is true, the New Testament documents would be as distinct from the Old Testament as is an ethical treatise on a timeless principle from an historical witness to a person acting in history. I am not as sure as Leivestad that this was the view of the early Christians or of Jesus. The title of the book is better chosen than that of the last chapter: *Christ* (not Love) *the Conqueror.*

The book is still valuable as an exegetical and analytical study. Leivestad's thorough knowledge of the field of New Testament studies is an education in itself. Likewise, Leivestad's exegesis is a serious and fair attempt to get at the truth of the text. Because of this his exegesis is fruitful and suggestive to a person who might not agree with all the details of his position. This says a great deal for his book. Incidental to his theology is the excellent command of English displayed in this volume, written originally in English. For further clarification of his position, the reviewer would have liked to see among Leivestad's wide bibliography some reference to Oliver Quick's work on the victory motif in *The Gospel of the New World,* a work that in some areas parallels the book under review.

David M. Granskou

Old Testament in Modern Research. By Herbert F. Hahn. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1954. 267 pages. $4.

It is difficult for an author working outside of his field of specialty to remain up-to-date. It is difficult for a denominational press to publish on time, scholarly acceptable books which pay off. Unfortunately this book was unable to overcome either of the difficulties. Despite a blurb which says "carefully annotated and up-to-date bibliography" there is no book listed which was published after 1949 and only a few in the forties. Several books which had revisions issued were used in their older editions. This may not be the fault of the author, since denom-

inational publishing houses frequently have manuscripts floating around for several years.

Despite the blurb "the whole sweep of current thinking on the study of the Old Testament" the theological renaissance receives sketchy, unsympathetic, bibliographic treatment in the last 23 pages, and the Dead Sea Scrolls are relegated to a footnote. Obviously the author has been unable to keep up or catch up with the feeling in the field during the last two decades. His book reflects the thinking of pre-World War II, if not pre-depression scholarship. Several of the schools of thought he tries to present arose after he had "finished" his study. This volume attempts to trace the various schools of thought in the history of Old Testament interpretation in a popular account. It is too deep for the average layman and too misleading for the pastor. The pastor would do better to study Rowley's "Old Testament and Modern Study" and to rethink his theology and archaeology with the "Studies in Biblical Theology."

C. Umhau Wolf

The Rediscovery of the Bible. By William Neil. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. 255 pages. $3.

Does the Bible still have anything to say to us today after the critical study for the last century? That is the question which William Neil, warden of Hugh Stewart Hall, University of Nottingham, England, attempts to answer in the affirmative in this work. The work is both popular and scholarly, but is predominantly valuable as a Christian interpretation of biblical history for scholars.

To the mind of this reviewer, the book has three main values. It clears the ground of misconceptions concerning the Bible. It gives a good summary of the work of historical criticism up to the present time. And it gives us the modern thought about the Bible. Prof. L. Harold DeWolf of the Boston University School of Theology writes in the Foreword that it is "a panoramic view of recent biblical studies and of the Bible itself."

The author certainly has no "magical" view of Scripture, and perhaps will shock many Lutherans by his explanation of many critical and historical problems. He, for example, conceives of the Old Testament as being filled with "stories," "legends," "apocryphal material," and "traditional tales," with no particular bearing on God's revelation to man. Adam is not regarded as historical, representing only the race, while Abraham is a historical personage. The distinctive material about Elijah, Elisha, Samson, and Daniel is based on "traditional tales," rather than historical facts, and emphasis is also made on the growth of the "miraculous" deeds in the Book of the Acts. The Scriptures arose out of an evolutionary process, but where natural cause ends and divine revelation begins is difficult to detect. The author assumes the multiple authorship of all later books of the Old Testament, and Paul is credited with only ten epistles.

Lutherans will hardly be satisfied with the author's attitude to the "accumulated evil of mankind," which "we all *to some extent* inherit," for the guilt of sin is never clearly stated.

The last chapter of the book, "The Bible in the Twentieth Century," states the purpose very clearly in these words: "We must steer a middle course between a fruitless effort to reinstate biblical words and ideas which are now merely lifeless relics of the past, and the equally profitless and more dangerous endeavor to lose contact with the historical basis and restate the Bible in the terminology of Marx or Freud or the Existentialists" (p. 248).

But also a word of commendation. Mr. Neil gives an excellent summary of Old Testament history. He states that the unusual power of Christ in the miracles is beyond question, and one of Christ's best claims. The church certainly must use all of the modern discoveries and aids to a better understanding of the Bible, and need fear nothing from a careful study of the background of our Scriptures. We agree with Neil that "by availing itself of all the new light that the various branches of science can supply, our twentieth century people can recognize at once that here in the Bible is a message that is timeless, as relevant today as when it was first written."

The book will serve as an introduction to Bible studies for the layman, although per-

haps at first upsetting, and a refresher course and a summation for the Bible student and scholar. It is one of the many new books that are valuable to harness the new interest in the Bible to a sound theological basis.

OLAF K. STORAASLI

Fools For Christ. By Jaroslav Pelikan. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1955. 172 pages. $3.

Although this book is announced on its jacket as a "new analysis of the concept of the Holy," this statement may be misleading because the book is certainly not an analysis of a *concept.* The author declares his thesis to be a study of "the *relation* between Christianity and the problem of value, either the impossibility of equating the Holy with one or another value, or the necessity of subjecting all values to the Holy." The key word is relation. Improper relationships through identification with the Holy, and proper relationship through subjection to the Holy are brilliantly set forth and examined in six essays. The author uses six writers to provide bases for his own penetrating analyses.

Kierkegaard is chosen to disintegrate the identification of the *True* and the Holy. Because he understood truth as the personal communion into which God called him by knowing him in Christ, Kierkegaard expressed his contempt for the pretensions of a dogmatism which bound truth to an airtight, conceptual compartment. He rejected the identification of the Holy and True because of what it does to the relationship between God and man. On the other hand, the writings of Paul set forth truth which is subjected to the Holy. To him truth came in Christ; this was its locus. Man does not climb to the Holy by means of his true systems, but the truth in Christ comes to man thereby making him holy.

Illumination on the relationship between the Holy and the *Good* comes from the writings of Dostoevsky and Luther. The Russian's penetrating focus lies in his insistence that sin is not primarily moral but religious. Because he was another mad "fool," he was able to see that God is not primarily concerned with making men good. God's basic concern is to restore men to fellowship with Him. Luther found the Good in God instead of looking for it in goodness. For him, the "Good became Holy, not by idolatrous identification of the two but by inclusion in the obedience of faith."

Whereas Nietzsche sought to ascend to the Holy only to find out that he had eliminated God as the ultimate projection of the Beautiful, Bach represents man's creativity in which "the priority of the Holy is productive in the interpretation of the Beautiful." The Beautiful is not to be understood in a derivative relationship to the Holy "but as a genus of holiness in and of itself." The complexity of the author's argument makes these two chapters somewhat more difficult to follow than the other sections.

The author has wasted few words in this penetrating study. His vast store of knowledge is carefully confined to one problem seen from three perspectives. With the exception of the last chapter on Bach, a lively style characterizes the entire study. For this reason, many serious readers, especially college and university professors, who usually avoid theological studies will find this book disarming and provocative. A few theologians may cast it aside after the first two chapters, but they will not be able to forget or dismiss the author's judgments of idolatrous identifications of human values and the Holy. It is very difficult to miss or forget the author's thesis. He repeats it in six different ways.

ROBERT W. LARSEN

The Christian Hope. By T. A. Kantonen. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1954. 114 pages. $1.50.

These 1954 Knubel-Miller Foundation Lectures surely make up one of the most helpful of the many books published on the main theme of the Evanston Assembly. Here is a sound treatment of the problems revolving about the Christian hope which faces the issues squarely and discusses them in the context of current conversation about eschatology.

Central to the author's orientation is a resolute adherence to the Word in Luther's understanding of it as "the gospel of God

concerning his Son." He attempts to "abide by the Word even when it contradicts our wishes and traditions, and to be silent where the Word is silent." Eschatology, as every other Christian doctrine, must be seen in the light of the Word, God's revelation of himself in Christ. Thus the author's method becomes an attempt to construct a Christian eschatology on the firm foundation of Christology. "It is not a kind of imaginative appendix to the rest of theology, a curious set of calculations and speculations about an unknown future. . . . It is not so much a separate doctrine as it is the key to all other doctrines. God and man, creation and redemption, sin and grace, the church, the Word and sacraments, all obtain their final meaning in the light of the consummation of God's purpose in Christ." "The key to this many-sided content of the Christian hope is 'Christ Jesus our hope.' It is a hope which centers neither upon first things nor last things, but upon him who is first and last, who came, who is present, and who is to come."

Wth the great majority of contemporary scholars, Professor Kantonen accepts the contributions of both Albert Schweitzer and C. H. Dodd to our understanding of eschatology, and refuses to be caught in an either-or. Fundamentally, there is no conflict between "futuristic" and "realized" eschatology. Both are essential to our understanding of the Christian hope and are dependent upon one another.

Another feature in the author's orientation is the broadness in which he sees the significance of eschatology. No Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the individual soul, the Christian doctrine of eschatology has to do with God's purpose for all men and for all time. Thus he states it as his aim in writing the book "to set forth in the light of Christ-centered revelation what the future holds both for individuals and the race, both within history and beyond it." The *Kingdom of God* is not the historic church, nor a moral ideal, nor a mere social hope. It is an "essentially eschatological reality." The cosmic and historic implications of the *Kingdom of God* make it impossible to think about eschatology in purely individualistic terms.

Orientated around the centrality of the Word, the validity of *both* "futuristic" *and* "realized" eschatology, and the cosmic and historic dimensions of the Christian hope, the author discusses succinctly the nature of the Christian hope, death, the state after death, the Christian view of history, the Antichrist, the millenium, the relevance of apocalyptic, the last judgment, the life everlasting, and other sub-topics of Christian eschatology.

Dr. Kantonen is well acquainted with the contemporary literature, and writes in constant and lively discussion with significant positions other than his own. The reader will be especially thankful for the references to the work of Finnish scholars such as Nikolainen, Virkkunen, and Alanen, whose writings are largely inaccessible except to the very few who are able to handle this language.

This is not what one would call a major contribution to the field, but it is an excellent summary of the chief problems and of the main lines of possible interpretation. It is a rare combination of popular style and scholarly content. As an introduction to this field, the reviewer knows of nothing better than this little volume.

Unfortunately, there is no index. The author does include, however, a helpful bibliography of thirty important books on the subject.

James H. Burtness

Guide to Christian Living. By Otto W. Heick. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1954. 229 pages. $3.

"This volume is designed to be a brief exposition of the Christian way of life," and "to lend weight to a conception of the Christian way of life which, in contrast to every sort of ethical idealism, is thoroughly grounded in the Gospel." The author finds his primary sources in Luther and in the Lutheran Confessions, but also leans heavily on the work of Adolf Schlatter, Adolf Koeberle, Paul Althaus, and Emil Brunner. Sixty-two pages are devoted to the first three parts which deal with fundamental considerations: "Approach to Ethics," "Basic

Truths," and "The Christian and His God." The rest of the book, parts four and five, deals with the more concrete ethical issues of "The Christian's Personal Life" and "The Christian in the World."

Dr. Heick defines Christian ethics as "the science not of the customs observed by Christion people but rather of the divine imperative implied in the message of the Bible. Fundamentally, it deals with the knowledge and the obedient fulfillment of the will of God." Unlike Anders Nygren and others who emphasize the divine indicative to the exclusion of the imperative, the author sets the two side by side. With Schlatter, he sees ethics as the "second word" of the biblical message, the "first word" being "the proclamation of God's own activity for the salvation of man." Dogmatics and ethics may be separated for the practical purpose of logical discussion, but in actuality, they are inseparable.

In a fine chapter entitled "God Rules," the author discusses the divine imperative of love. "Because the will of God is essentially one, the divine imperative also is one. . . . We are never asked to do anything else but love." "Christian ethics is an organic whole, not an agglomeration of 'cases.'" There is to be "cooperation" between the divine imperative and the historical forms of life because "the Christian continues to be a real human being." Yet "the divine imperative acts not as a constitutive but as a regulative force." At the same time there is to be "prophetic criticism" as the Church at all times calls the attention of men to death. Coupled with this there is to be "prophetic charity," the works of love.

The major portion of the book is devoted to statements on specific problems of Christian ethics, both in the personal and the social realms. Such varied issues as euthanasia, artificial insemination, athletics, truth and lie, birth control, education, comic books, socialism and communism, political parties, race prejudice, lodges, science, stewardship and many others are taken up and discussed briefly. These are sound and provocative statements, although the movement from the foundation laid in the first three parts of the book to the statements made in the last two parts is not always an obvious one. The reader may also feel that some of the problems are handled a bit too summarily.

Consistent with his Reformation orientation, the author calls for a Christian ethic "thoroughly grounded in the gospel." He states that "ethics and eschatology belong together," that "correctly interpreted, all Christian ethics is 'interim ethics.' . . . It is concrete in every instance. The Christian life is existential living, i.e., in a series of life's alternatives a serious responsible decision has to be made that affects the whole self." In another place we see that "forgiveness or justification has far-reaching consequences." This is all to the good.

But if this is true, then is not the primary task of ethical construction one of method rather than of content? That is, as soon as we leave an authoritarian ethic behind, does not the primary ethical question become the problem of how I am to *go about* choosing between the alternatives that confront me day by day in a world shot through with sin and death? I can no longer get answers from anyone else. *I* must decide. What do the fact of the Gospel, and of God's act of justification, and the eschatological hope have to do with the *manner* in which I seek to know and do the will of God in concrete situations? It is the apparent lack of concern for ethical methodology which the reviewer would see as a possible weakness of this study.

It is also significant to note that the author seems to see only the negative implications of the relation between eschatology and ethics, that is, that "no form of man's social, economic, and political life ought therefore to be equated with the Kingdom." The positive influence of a thoroughly eschatological orientation for Christian ethics is nowhere developed.

However, Dr. Heick has given us a brief but solid discussion of ethical issues in the light of a personal knowledge of the writings of Martin Luther, and has succeeded in capturing in short summary statements the essential problems and solutions which grow out of a truly evangelical faith. The book is well-written, always both helpful and stimulating, and would serve excellently as

the basis for discussion groups in this field on either the parish or the student level.

The author includes a selected bibliography of almost one hundred books on various ethical problems.

JAMES H. BURTNESS

Conscience and Compromise. By Edward LeRoy Long, Jr. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954. 166 pages. $3.

The subject discussed in this book is the problem created by the circumstances that the absolute ethical ideal of the Gospel comes into conflict at so many different points with the practical necessities imposed upon the Christian by the culture of which he is a part.

One way to resolve this conflict is the ascetic or sectarian withdrawal from culture since it seemingly cannot be harmonized with the absolute command of the Gospel, for instance, the Sermon on the Mount. This is admittedly a heroic way, but it is self-defeating. It defeats its own high purpose by failing to understand that culture, secularized and sinful as it is, is the very medium through which the Christian ethic can express itself.

An alternative to withdrawal is a too easy rationalization of the apparent necessities imposed upon the Christian by secularized culture. The Christian conscience cannot feel at ease with this solution either.

A third alternative is what Dr. Long calls the "dialectic of casuistry," a solution worked out through the tension between the absolute ethic of the Gospel on the one hand and the compromise demanded by the practical cultural situation on the other hand. The author is anxious to lift the idea of casuistry out of its odious Jesuitical associations and to restore it to evangelical use. "Casuistry," he says, "is not just the science of compromise; it is the reasonable service of the conscience which calls Christians to express loving concern for their fellow man within the limits of social possibility." This is not to be confused with the easy "golden mean" between legalism on the one hand and antinomianism on the other. No, it is rather an "anxious struggle" to realize in the fullest possible degree the agape of the Gospel in a given situation where its absolute realization is impossible.

The thesis of this little book is of course not new. By now every discussion of Christian ethics which is at all realistic recognizes it with a greater or lesser degree of seriousness. Dr. Long's treatment of it is nevertheless a valuable contribution to present-day discussions on Christian ethics. Its definition of casuistry in its proper use is good. As a teacher of Christian ethics the reviewer would recommend it as useful collateral reading for the student of Christian ethics in the theological seminary. A very real merit of this little book is that it handles an exceedingly difficult subject in such a manner as to make it understandable to not a few lay people who may chance to read it.

THEO. I. JENSEN

Die Arbeit nach der Lehre der Bibel. By Walther Bienert. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1954. 454 pages.

This is a great book, the result of twenty years of research on the problem of the *Arbeitsethos* (ethic of work) in the Bible and, to some extent, in Greek thought.

The book divides into two main parts:

In Part One the author discusses the concept of labor in the Old Testament and post-biblical Judaism, and the effect of the Greek view of life on certain Jewish writers.

The Bible, the author maintains, does not actually contain an *Arbeitsethik,* a fixed code and rule of labor. Instead, it speaks of an *Arbeitsethos* confronting man with the commandments of the living God.

In working, man takes part in the creative activity of God. Labor possesses the dignity of a divine order. Its goal is the *gloria Dei,* its purpose to provide man with all the necessaries of life. The ability to work productively belongs to the very essence of man. In this respect a deep cleavage exists between the Bible and Greek thought which regarded manual labor as a degradation for a free citizen and identified it with the nature of slavery.

However, in Scripture too, especially in the Old Testament, we find another aspect of labor. Since the Fall labor means for man also toil and sweat. Fallen man often works

in vain; and decidedly in our work we experience the limitation of life.

Part Two deals with the ethic of the New Testament. In five chapters the author presents his findings as to the contributions made by Jesus, the primitive church, Paul and the other writers of the New Testament.

Labor, according to Jesus, is characterized by three main features: (1) it is performed with faith in God, the Father; (2) it is an expression of the gratitude of the forgiven sinner; (3) it is performed as a service to the neighbor. All three aspects, the author emphasizes, are essential to the teaching of our Lord.

As compared with the Old Testament there is something else that is new in the teaching of Jesus. Work is not exhausted, according to Jesus, in what belongs to the field of economics. None of the prophets of old was, as it were, a full-time worker in the Kingdom. Yet Jesus was, and so were his disciples. Consequently he regarded his own mission and that of his disciples as work which should also provide them with a living. Jesus and the Twelve are the first *Berufsarbeiter* of the world (p. 208). For them labor was rooted in a divine call. It was a vocation in the best sense of the term. (But is this principle actually so new? Did not the priests of the Old Testament live in the temple? Was their office not a vocation?)

The apostolic church built its ethic on the foundation laid by Jesus. The venture of the Jerusalem church to have everything in common was not the realization of a "Christian" theory of economics but rather a spontaneous expression of genuine brotherly love (p. 289).

Paul combined in a unique way the life of a manual laborer with his vocation as an Apostle of Jesus Christ. (But did he not also follow a precedent set by other rabbis?) Living in idleness by depending on others is to him something unbecoming to a Christian. Even the intense eschatological hope did not make Paul indifferent to the things that pertain to this life; rather it served him as an incentive to an orderly constructive and productive view of labor. And the slaves should realize that by faithful work they ought to prove themselves to be true followers of Jesus (Eph. 6:5 ff.). Labor, then, is to Paul a social factor creating a productive economically independent fellowship united in loving service.

In fine, according to the Bible, man serves God, labor serves man, and man's labor in turn is service to God. Work, therefore, cannot enslave a Christian man; it is not an ideal which he worships. Thus he will remain free from the service of Mammon, from greed and worry. He will not be turned into a beast of burden because all work is related to God in whom man is called to find rest.

This in brief is an outline of the main argument of the work which the author exemplifies and undergirds with many a detailed analysis of scriptural passages.

The author seems to be a grateful follower of Karl Barth. In fact, some of the latter's sophisticated exegetical stunts are also found in this book. For instance, in the opening chapter of Part One as well as in the concluding chapter of Part Two the author says repeatedly that the divine injunction to work has its origin in the divine commandment to rest. In Scripture, he says, rest precedes work. But this is not true. The commandment to work, as related in Genesis 1:28 comes in time before the Third Commandment of the Mosaic law in Exod. 20:8 f. and Deut. 5:14 ff. Having worked six days, the Lord rested on the seventh day, and not vice versa. This also applies to man. To be sure, our work does not justify us before God. But neither will God do his work if man does not respond to the order laid down in creation.

Commenting on the famous passage I Cor. 7:17-24, the *locus classicus* for Luther's doctrine of the *Beruf,* the author maintains that Luther's and Holl's interpretation is untenable. Paul did not use the word *klesis* as signifying our earthly calling. Verse 17, he says, is an unclassical yet popular abbreviation. In agreement with the Apostle's intentions it ought to read, "Let every one remain in the rank in which he received the call by which he was called (by God)." However, when all is said, the author admits that Luther's translation is in keeping with Paul's concept of work as a station assigned to man by God (pp. 338 ff.).

The book is well written. The style offers no particular difficulties, and we want to recommend it heartily to everyone who has a fair reading knowledge of German.

OTTO W. HEICK

This World and the Church. By Howard Hong. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1955. $2.50.

In a day when the subject called "Apologetics" is being held in contempt, and has been removed from the curricula of most of our seminaries, it is good to hear the voice of a Christian lay scholar summoning his church to reconsider her task in this area of life. Most certainly Dr. Hong shows us the need for a positive Lutheran apologetic, and points out an unmistakable path for us in meeting this need.

The insights of Dr. Hong concerning the present condition of our world come from first hand information. His answers to these needs also come from a deep understanding of men and movements. So often when one attempts to simplify great schools of philosophy into language understood by laymen he misses the real core, but not so in this book. Dr. Hong has a way of pin-pointing each movement and school of thought, and stating this in the language of the layman. This is truly the mark of a great teacher. To see the true wit of this man one needs only to look at the pithy captions of each chapter, i.e., "Pilate's Question" (What Is Truth?), "The Psalmist's Question" (What Is Man?). This is further proof that there is not one unnecessary word in this book. It also reflects the readable style of the author. There is only one place where a layman might have a problem and that is on page 124 where the author leaves untranslated the difficult German word "Anknuepfungspunkt."

In this book there is meat for the thinker, a digest for the student of the philosophies, sermon material for the preacher, a study course for laymen, and a solemn warning to all that are at ease in Zion. Anyone reading this book will lay it down with a deeper understanding of Luther and the real genius of the man for our day.

This book is worthy of a wide use in the church and ought to be recommended wholeheartedly to laymen and clergymen alike. It could well be used as a textbook in a study group of young people and adults.

G. F. SCHOTT

The Catholicity of Protestantism. Edited by R. Newton Flew and Rupert E. Davies. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, n.d. 159 pages. $1.75.

Recently one of those "intelligent laymen," for whom not a few theological books are now being considered digestible fare, visited my study where he saw this book lying on the desk. The comment of this man—he is a professor of nuclear medicine (that was a new one to me, too)—was this: "Doesn't that title contain terms which are mutually exclusive?"

For a people long-conditioned to pit "Protestantism" against "Catholicity" and unaccustomed to make any distinction between "Catholic" and "catholic," the question seems best answered in the affirmative. However, it is the thesis of this book that when a Protestant confesses, "I believe . . . in the Holy Catholic Church," he is not mistaken, but is acknowledging and claiming that the Holy Spirit has made him a member of the Body of Christ, the church universal.

This book is one of three documents presented as reports to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Shortly after the war the archbishop, desiring to further understanding and unity within the non-Roman portion of England's ecclesiastical population, invited three groups, one Catholic Anglican, one Evangelical Anglican, and one the Free Churches, to prepare statements of their respective theological views. The "Catholic" wing of the Church of England issued its report under the title *Catholicity.* The "Evangelical" group within the same communion called its report *The Fullness of Christ.* From the Free Church side appeared the volume under review.

Written by thirteen leading Free Church theologians (in addition to the editors, other well-known names such as T. W. Manson, John Marsh, Nathaniel Micklem, Gordon Rupp, and Philip Watson appear on the list), *The Catholicity of Protestantism* presents in the first two chapters a general statement

on "Protestantism" and a treatment of "The Concept of Catholicity and The Faith of Protestantism."

With this introductory work done, the authors proceed with obvious enthusiasm and no little scholarship well-seasoned with religious concern to set forth the theology of the reformers, which they maintain has been misunderstood at significant points and therefore seriously misrepresented by the authors of *Catholicity*. One example is the "Catholic" misunderstanding of Luther's view of natural theology. Luther did, in a sense, discard natural theology, but it was a rejection which rested on the fact that he did not think "in terms of the scholastic antithesis between nature and grace." Actually Luther's doctrine of grace, rather than denying the reality of nature, was a vigorous defense of its true character. Instead of teaching a "natural theology," Luther could be said to have expounded an evangelical "theology of the natural."

Chapters on "Justification and Sanctification," "The Church, Ministry, Sacraments" also reflect in a convincing manner the insights of Luther and Calvin.

One of the best chapters, it seems to this reviewer, is that which treats of "The Doctrine of Authority." Pointing out that this is the crucial question confronting the churches today, the authors state that absolute authority rests only in Christ, the Word of God. To speak of "objective" authority resting elsewhere is misleading, for the "Apostolic Church and its Scripture, the Church of the ages, and enlightened individuals, are *witnesses,* and have no independent authority in the strict sense." It is through these witnesses, however, that we alone have access to the objectively authoritative Word. In summary, it is said, "We claim that this doctrine of authority is necessitated by the pre-eminence of Christ and the historical facts of the Apostolic Church; that it was upheld by the early Fathers, distorted by Basil and Augustine and their followers in the churches of the West and the East, and restored by the Reformation."

Two appendices make especially rewarding reading. The first, "The Freedom and Bondage of the Will," is a succinct statement of the doctrine of predestination as held by Luther and Calvin, both of whom are subjected to the criticism that "the idea that God before all creation decreed . . ." the particular election of some, leaving the rest to be lost, "imperils both the doctrine of grace and the believer's assurance."

The second appendix is a rousing justification of Luther's translation of Romans 3:28. Luther's insertion of the word "alone" has caused his opponents to charge him with falsifying the Scripture. "But Luther," say the authors, "knew much better than they what he was about." To support this judgment they quote extensively from, and comment constructively on, Luther's open letter "On Translating."

Here, then, is a book which gives clear testimony to the elements of Christian "catholicity" which are present in the evangelical theology of classical Protestantism. To those who are engaged in furthering the ecumenical movement, this report will come as an encouragement. To those who are inclined to be darkly suspicious of all attempts at inter-church understanding and to dismiss the ecumenical movement as doctrinally "indifferent" and its leaders as being "shot through with modernism," this book will serve as a needed corrective.

Franklin Clark Fry, who has written the preface to the American edition published by Muhlenberg, remarks that "Lutherans will be interested, and humbled, to see how widely" the catholicity of Protestantism "rests on the insights and words of Martin Luther." Interested? Yes. Humbled? We hope so!

E. Clifford Nelson

The Lord's Supper: Seven Meanings. By Harold Fey. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948. 117 pages. $1.75.

"Once a church which possessed no paid ministry, no priesthood, no cathedrals or church buildings, no endowments, no salaried bishops or secretaries, and no publicity except the lies told by its enemies, held a disintegrating world together and laid the basis of a new civilization. Its power was not its own. What it had was a gift. The gift given it in meetings of little groups who assembled

before dawn in houses on back streets and in caves under Rome. Those who gathered heard sermons only infrequently, when men like Paul the sail-maker came their way. But whenever they met they broke bread with gladness and singleness of heart and shared the cup of their covenant with Christ. What did that church have that we do not have today?"

With these words Dr. Fey, on page 8, sets forth the Apology for his book. In a time when there is confusion and fear, bewilderment and doubt, it behooves all men to rediscover the wellsprings of faith, strength and power. Over the long ages the Lord's Supper has been the "watering place" for Christian people, where again and again they have laid hold on that grace by which they have held their world together. To understand the Eucharist so as to recover that same grace is the deep need of every generation, and not least our own.

Although the Lord's Supper has meant many things to many men, there are, according to Dr. Fey, seven fundamental truths imbedded in this central act of Christian worship.

It is first an act of remembrance, not of something far away and long ago, not of death and destruction, but of Someone who is risen from the dead and lives in the midst of his friends. The Eucharist is no gravestone, it is the acknowledgment of life.

It is an act of thanksgiving, which is the essential meaning of the very term "eucharist." And who has greater occasion for gratitude than the Christian? It is he who has experienced the redeeming power and grace of the living Christ both as a present fact and a future hope.

The Eucharist is the expression of a covenant between the living Christ and those who receive this sacrament. Those who come to the Lord's table are required to examine their own hearts and lives and to seek penitently for the renewal of a right spirit. So communion becomes commitment to the way of the Cross.

The Lord's Supper is an affirmation and renewal of the fellowship of the believer with Christ and his church. Nowhere does the fact of the communion of saints receive clearer and more compelling expression than in the Eucharist, for here we affirm our living relationship with Christ the Head of the church and through him with his people everywhere.

The Lord's Supper is spiritual nourishment. No living organism is self-sufficient, possessing within itself adequate resources to sustain life. From the tiniest insect on up the scale of life to man, all are pensioners upon the bounty and goodness of God. In the Eucharist this dependence upon God as the Giver of every good gift is not only expressed, the life giving gifts are in fact imparted and received.

The Eucharist means atonement, for it speaks of One who has given himself for the sins of the world in order that in him all men might find forgiveness and reconciliation with the Father.

Finally, the Lord's Supper is the celebration of the fact and the declaration of the hope of immortality. Those who participate in the central act of worship "do proclaim the Lord's death until he comes." The deliverance which the risen Christ has wrought stretches out beyond this life and opens into a blessed eternity. The courage and joy of every Christian derives from this faith, for "if God be for us then who can be against us?" We need fear no foe, not even death, for Christ is the Victor and in him we are at last really free.

These seven meanings in no sense exhaust the significance of the Lord's Supper, but they point in the direction of that understanding which will make the Eucharist truly meaningful to every Christian.

If Dr. Fey would have been less cautious in affirming the real presence of Christ in the Supper, he would have strengthened his entire book. However, as it stands, this little book will reward the reader with many rich and suggestive insights.

G. Everett Arden

The Gift of Power. By Lewis Joseph Sherrill. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955. 200 pages. $3.

Every Sunday morning Lutheran congregations hear mighty words in the Absolution: ". . . to them that believe on His

Name *He gives power to become* the sons of God and has promised them His Holy Spirit. . . ." Dr. Sherrill's thesis is: "The Christian religion can teach men how to receive a gift of interior, spiritual power sufficient to enable them to cope with the gift of exterior, physical power which has been granted. The nature of this power is well expressed in the phrase *'the power to become.'* In its simplest terms this means that the power which can be received is the power to become a self who can cope with himself in the modern world, and with the world in which we must live." What Sherrill proposes rings true to Lutheran ears, and performs a wonderful service to us all in showing the relationship of many strains of modern psychological inquiry to a philosophy of education which is concerned primarily with revelation.

If Christian education is "the attempt . . . to participate in and to guide the *changes which take place in persons* in their relationships with God, with the church, with other persons, with the physical world and with oneself," then it is of first importance that we understand the human self which is involved in those *changes.* By thinking of the self as a living body we are saved from losing the biblical meaning of *soul* and consequently separating religion from life. (We Lutherans are currently engaged in much relearning at this point, I think.) The "No" and the "Yes" of the self determining "I" establishing limits around what he will or will not "willingly" do or permit to be done to him, the "I" of a being who is *conscious of being,* and the "I" that can transcend itself to "think about me," together with the potential self in the concept of being created in the image of God, are all given clear delineation. The chapter on "Threats to the Self" is a brilliant statement of what Sherrill calls "the predicament of normal anxiety." It is always stimulating to think through basic truths without using customary (and often, therefore, thoughtless) terminology, but the analysis at this point is so keen that one could wish the author had written his understandings of *sin* and *original sin* into the chapter.

Significant—even determinative—for the philosophy of Christian education being developed here are three concepts of the Christian community. *"The self is formed in its relationships with others.* If it becomes deformed, it becomes so in its relationships. If it is re-formed or trans-formed, that too will be in its relationships." The Christian community can know itself only from within, and this consists primarily in *knowing itself as a worshipping community.* The Christian community is a *koinonia* and transcends ordinary human community in that "the Spirit of God is forthgoing into, and present in, every relationship within the community."

Christian education must be consistent with the "core principle of revelation"—what happens in the encounter between God as Self and man as a self. "Strictly speaking, then, this education is not God-centered, nor is it man-centered. It is bi-polar; that is, it is concerned with the *meeting* between God and the human creature, and with the tension which rises within the encounter, calling for human response to God and for divine response to man." The Bible is the written record of the original revelation by which the church was called into being and to which it owes its continuing existence. It faces us with the record of God's disclosure of himself through such media as physical nature, human nature, the events of history, and above all the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, the incarnate Word of God. The central purpose in using the Bible in Christian education is to prepare the way for personal encounter—to perceive God and respond to him in the present—within the context of the worshipping community. This purpose can set us free from using the Bible as a means whereby we try to manipulate the conduct of the members of the Christian community—a means for putting pressure on the young to follow our notions of Christian conduct, which "has perhaps done more than any other one thing to cause the young to regard religious teaching with suspicion and put up their guard against it." Developing types of teaching characterized by becoming involved in the Bible, in contrast with being put under pressure from the Bible, will be, therefore, our main concern. Frank instruction in biblical content will be important too, for the Bible is, so to speak, the mother tongue of the Christian community, and we

cannot talk of the deepest concerns of the human soul in Christian terms without knowing this language. The biblical *symbols* of encounter (Blood, Wine, Bread, Altar, King, Ruler, Remembering, Setting slaves free, etc.) will therefore become basic curriculum content in Christian education. A further basic content of education will be the "themes" (Creation, Lordship, Vocation, Judgment, Redemption, Re-creation, Providence, the Life of Faith) of the Bible which speak to man's "predicament" (a persisting human concern which tends to recur generation after generation). "The relevance of revelation lies in the fact that the disclosure fits the need."

Methods of guiding the "changes which take place in persons" will depend upon our understanding of how changes in the self do take place. The reader will look far to find a more trenchant delineation of the various streams of psychological thought behind educational methods than the seventeen pages given in this volume. In eleven propositions for the selection and adaptation of biblical materials Dr. Sherrill lays groundwork for serious re-thinking of what has passed for Christian education. He tests method with two questions: 1) Does it facilitate *two-way* communications between selves? and 2) What is the nature of the interaction which it sets up between persons? (*demonic*—when the changes it produces in persons are such as to weaken, damage, paralyze, or delude the self in whom the changes take place; or *spiritual*—when the changes it produces in persons are such as to lead the self into a deepening fellowship with God, into fellowship with others in the life of faith, and into fuller realization of its potentialities as a human creature made in the image of God). He offers seven principles based on some fact in the psychology of interaction, which apply to method in using the Bible: nonverbal communication, participation, identification, perception, symbolic communication, ambivalence, and ultimacy. In the light of what is known about learning and the deeper changes in the self, it is unthinkable that any current appraisal of Christian educational philosophy could avoid such principles. In the light of God's gift of the "power to become" it is unthinkable that serious Christian leadership could avoid such re-appraisal.

C. Richard Evenson

At All Times and in All Places. By Massey H. Shepherd, Jr. Greenwich, Conn.: The Seabury Press, 1953.

In this little volume of eighty pages the author has depicted in narrative form the celebration of the Holy Communion in different periods of Christian history. The result is a highly suggestive and extremely readable history of the Eucharist. He illustrates amply the variations in practice which have characterized the respective celebrations but concludes that "the service remains throughout the ages essentially the same as that the apostles received from the Lord Jesus at the Last Supper" (vii). The selection of the periods to be represented reveals the author's own lineage and something of his theological predisposition as well. The scenes of the celebration are taken from the years A.D. 150, A.D. 500, A.D. 1400, A.D. 1665, A.D. 1830, and one is projected into 1960. The omission of the period of the Reformation and the consequent absence of any recognition of the impact of the Reformation upon the eucharistic rite is not likely to escape the attention of the Lutheran reader.

Professor Shepherd is an authentic liturgical scholar and one may be assured that the narrative accounts are in accord with historical practice. It is not, however, a book for the liturgical student exclusively or even primarily. No one can read these chapters without experiencing a profound sense of reverence in the presence of the Sacrament and a new appreciation of what it can mean to modern man. This seems even more true of historical chapters than of the final one which seeks to conform more directly to the needs of modern man. Here something of the glorious mystery is obscured by the emphasis upon the Bread and the Wine as symbols of man's economic life, given first to God and then returned to nurture the worshiper.

The preacher will find some rich suggestions for his own communion meditations in these chapters and he may gain, also, an

appreciation of how the celebration of the Holy Communion can become a high moment in the troubled existence of early creatures as they face the complications and involvements of their world.

EDGAR M. CARLSON

The Nature of Christian Worship. By J. Alan Kay. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954. 115 pages. $2.50.

The four chapter headings indicate the major accents in this very readable little book which approaches worship from the theoretical point of view.

The first chapter, Union with God through Christ, sets forth the evangelical nature of the author's position. It is unfortunate that the weakest portion of the book, in this reviewer's opinion, is the opening section where he finds in a rather forced and artificial way the four major elements in worship, adoration, sacrifice, receiving God's Word (in lesson and sermon), and making requests in four major traditions in Christian worship, Eastern Orthodox, Roman, Protestant and the prayer meeting. Once past this artificial oversimplification, the book is far more rewarding. The author reveals in the thorough documentation of his argument a broad knowledge of the field.

The point of view set forth in the second chapter on Corporateness in Worship is a balanced one. The place of the individual in corporate worship is not deemphasized. "The worship of the Church must therefore combine both the individual and the corporate. It is possible to overemphasize either, and a Christian service must maintain the right balance between them." There is a suggestive passage on the use of dialogue in worship to express and strengthen the bond of unity between individuals.

The chapter on the Means of Worship (symbols) says nothing very new but serves to remind the reader of the obvious and thus recall what may readily be overlooked. There are provocative sections on symbols and time, and symbols and the unconscious.

The culminating chapter on the Holy Communion is valuable chiefly for the breadth of treatment. The author emphasizes the infinite variety of meanings and associations which come to a focus in the communion. "Communion is a summing up of the whole of worship in one action." But the author has no "high church" axe to grind: "There is no need to seek the explanation (of the special richness and efficacy of the sacrament) in some peculiar grace given in Communion that is not given elsewhere, and we have found no trace of any such thing. What is received is the gift of God himself, and, as we have seen, we receive him in all forms of worship."

Lutheran readers will find the author's general viewpoint congenial. They will undoubtedly question, however, the author's interpretation of I Cor. 11:29, "This seems to mean not that the worshippers must discern that the bread is the Lord's body, but that they, the Church, are the Lord's body; and that these breaches in fellowship make true worship impossible." The point is well taken and may well be an implication in Paul's words but to offer it as the only interpretation of the text is to be seriously questioned. This, however, was the only point where the reviewer took serious issue with the author's otherwise careful and scholarly treatment of sources. The book is commended to pastors and thoughtful laymen as a brief and often refreshing approach to Christian worship.

EDMUND A. STEIMLE

The Mediaeval Latin Hymn. By Ruth Ellis Messenger. Washington: Capital Press, 1953. 138 pages. $3.25.

The author of this "essay in the field of religious culture" sets out to investigate the "history of the mediaeval Latin hymn from the point of view of usage." Her interest is in sources, influences, forms, and "collections" of the hymns which have constituted at least a part of the medium of worship in the western church for fifteen hundred years.

The Mediaeval Latin Hymn is a fresh and valuable contribution to the study of its subject. It is based on broad and deep research, which is scarcely suggested by the slender form in which it appears.

In her chapter dealing with the fourth century, Dr. Messenger considers the three writers (Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, and

Prudentius) who represent a "transition" between the "Silver Age" of Latin literature and the later literary tradition of the middle ages. With these is included the work of Fortunatus, who falls into a different class. It is interesting to note that the author identifies four "authentic extant" hymns of St. Ambrose, and eighteen which are thought to be "Ambrosian." In the latter group belongs *Splendor paternae gloriae,* which is still thought to be an authentic hymn of St. Ambrose by a good many recent scholars.

Probably the most original and helpful of the results of Dr. Messenger's study is the location of groups of Latin hymns into collections, called respectively "The Old Hymnal," and "The Later Hymnal." These terms mean simply that recognized bodies of hymns, employed in a fixed way mainly in the church offices, can be distinguished. But such recognition is important for the understanding of the problems of replacement, survival, and later usage of these hymns in the worship of the church.

Other matters discussed in the work relate to special kinds of hymns. The Sequence and the processional hymn are treated in a way that is most luminous. At the end of the volume there is a chapter which considers the influence and survival of the Latin hymn. There are also helps to the material included in the separate sections of the book: a collection of illustrative hymns with translations; notes on the chapters; an extensive bibliography; and indexes.

The modern reader of a book on the older hymnody of the church may well ask, "What has this to do with the use of hymns in the worship of today?" An examination of the listings in this book reveals the following use of English translations of Latin hymns in representative hymnals now current: from the "Old Hymnal" seven hymns continue in fairly general use; from the "Later Hymnal" there are eleven which appear in present-day collections; and of the items appearing in the "Index of Latin Hymns" at the end of the volume, there are thirty-seven, by conservative estimate, which continue to be included in our hymn-books.

One cannot conclude a review of *The Mediaeval Latin Hymn* without expressing one's gratification and thanks to the author of such an excellent piece of work.

George R. Seltzer

The Children's Hymnal. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955. 415 pages. $1.65.

This is easily the finest children's hymnal that has come to the attention of this reviewer. It has been put together with the thoroughness that usually goes into the compiling of the best adult hymnals. This is in marked contrast to most junior hymnals that usually look as though they have been thrown together as a temporary measure. The book is well bound and is tastefully decorated throughout with appropriate symbols and figures characterizing Christian virtues and the Christian life and experience. The cover is finished attractively and is made of materials that should wear well under constant, hard use.

The music and text type are clearly legible. One could wish however that the whole text, not just the first stanza, had been included within the double lines of music. Perhaps this would make it somewhat more difficult for the organist, but this difficulty would be more than balanced by the advantage gained for the singers.

A sound appreciation of the best in music is evident in the choice of tunes. There are some disappointments, the most startling perhaps being the use of the tune Picardy with the text, "Savior, Like a Shepherd Lead Us." Most people will have difficulty divorcing that tune from the text, "Let All Mortal Flesh Keep Silence." However, satisfying a catholic taste is a formidable task, and the editors have exhibited a balanced sense of judgment in this respect.

A valuable feature of the book is the section of devotional services for the church seasons. There is a service for each season with suggested readings, prayers, hymns, etc. This ought to prove invaluable in the training of children in worship procedures. The three creeds of the church are included, as is Luther's Small Catechism, and selections for responsive reading from the psalms and other Scriptures, and, finally, several pages of prayers for various occasions.

Indices include a topical index, an alphabetical and a metrical index of tunes, and the usual index of first lines.

If used in a thoughtful manner this hymnal could prove to be a valuable resource for the Sunday School and excellent training for the later use of the regular church hymnal, provided it be used as a supplement to it and not a substitute for it.

GERHARD M. CARTFORD

The Choirmaster's Workbook Vol. Four. Edited by Dayton W. Nordin. Rock Island, Ill.: Augustana Press, 1955. 195 pages. $2.50.

This book is exactly what its title says it is: a workbook for the choirmaster, or organist-choirmaster. It is divided into six general sections: 1) an introductory article by a prominent church musician, plus some general comments and suggestions by the editor, 2) a list of recommended choral numbers, each accompanied by a brief descriptive sentence, 3, 4, 6) work space, 3 being space in which to list the anthems in the choir library, 4 the space allotted to the weekly scheduling of the music pertaining to the service. This is the core of the book. Section 6 consists of some lined pages for the keeping of attendance. Section 5 is a list of longer, recommended choral compositions.

The book has undoubtedly grown out of a need felt by the editor for a well worked out manual to serve as a help and a guide for the serious director of church choirs. The editor has done a great deal of the work which, ideally, every director ought to do for himself. For those who have not time to spend hours searching for good, appropriate choir music it will prove very helpful because there are scores of anthems suggested. For the man who is already methodical the book will have mainly suggestive value. In the unmethodical it might well inspire the acquiring of method.

It has the disadvantages as well as the advantages of all planned workbooks: the user must of necessity fit himself into the scheme determined by the editor in order to make the best use of the book. In attempting to fit all choirmaster situations the book slights the approach of the liturgical church. The excellent practice of including the introits for each week, which the editor did in previous volumes, has been discontinued in this volume.

However, if the director is diligent in filling out the volume week by week, he will eventually have a handy, compact history of his choir's musical activity, a record which could be very useful from a reference point of view. Viewed in this light, and bearing in mind that the manual is meant to cover a two year period, one can justify what otherwise seems to be a high price for a workbook.

GERHARD M. CARTFORD

The Grandeur and Misery of Man. By David E. Roberts. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955. 186 pages. $3.

"Let us start, then, with man, no matter how much such a proposal may horrify some theologians." So wrote David Roberts (p. 61) in one of his sermons. Paul Tillich quotes that statement in his introduction to this collection of sermons by the late dean of students and Professor of Philosophy of Religion at Union Theological Seminary in New York. Roberts died recently at the age of 44.

The idea that preaching is essentially the saying of something meaningful *about man* has become the objectionable trademark of Protestant liberalism in the minds of many in the more conservative Protestant churches. Is not preaching the declaration of truth *about God?* Is not man's need chiefly a word from outside, a message of release and forgiveness from a God who is Lord and Savior? Isn't the gospel God's Word about Himself and what He has done and is doing *for* man, instead of a word *about man?*

I believe Roberts intends not to deny the affirmative answer to the above questions, but instead to stress the fact that the man to whom the gospel is preached must know and recognize his condition (or "predicament" or "plight") if the gospel is to mean anything to him. Every preacher agrees. There is disagreement concerning the nature of man's condition which makes the preaching necessary. Roberts is conscious of the distinction which Luther spoke of in terms of law and gospel and knows that God's re-

demption is understandable and welcome news only when man knows why he needs it. The gospel, then, is essentially that Word of God which frees man and enables him to be what he ought to be. The great truths of the faith such as forgiveness, God's act in Christ, faith as that which accepts God's grace, Christian freedom, responsibility among Christians for each other's welfare, are all at the heart of these sermons published following the author's death in January, 1955.

There are twenty sermons in the collection. They are of varying length but as a group would certainly qualify as "brief." This reviewer was conscious of no special order or scheme of arrangement of the sermons. They are perhaps samples of the man's pulpit work rather than a planned collection or group.

The sermons are easy to read and packed with meaning. The sentences and paragraphs are short and the thought is pungent and provocative. One wonders if, when delivered, the messages were not considerably extended and that what we have here is simply a rather detailed prose outline. Many sentences send the reader off thinking about what has been suggested and he is too soon called back to the next thought. This characteristic would be distressing to the listener if the sermons were delivered in just this form but when reading them one can linger where he will and then go on. And certainly the sermon which starts the mind going with many thoughts and drives the hearer to rethink his own thoughts on faith and life represents preaching at its best. The people who heard these sermons preached must have gone away with lots of food for thought.

What has been said above about the author's starting with man (and the title of the book, which is also the title of one of the sermons, emphasizes this) suggests that Roberts must have shared the viewpoints of such colleagues at Union as Paul Tillich and Reinhold Niebuhr. He represents what we have come to call the "existential" point of view. Man's situation is critical because he is forever confronted by the possibility of life or death. The seriousness of the gospel is in the fact that it reaches man at the point of his critical need and gives him that which he can stake his life on. As he claims in faith the gospel's promise he lives.

The idea of "tension" or the holdings of two seemingly different and even apparently contradictory truths is another characteristic of the Christian faith which is proclaimed in these sermons. Here again Roberts stands with the neo-orthodox school of his colleague Niebuhr and others. The Christian faith does not consist in resolving all issues but in accepting God's truth because it is the truth and because life demands this of us. An example of this is Roberts' explanation of Romans 11:33 in which he points out that Paul is exclaiming ". . . how unsearchable are his (God's) judgments . . ." immediately after explaining God's strange way of using the unbelief of the Jews as an instrument of salvation for the Gentiles. In other words, we accept both the unexplainable grace and Paul's explanation of it! Some choice portions of these sermons are the ones where the author deals with human suffering, anxiety, fear and hope. There is no doubt but that this man had lived intimately with God and had experienced much of the depth of grace. The great strength of the book is the way in which the author uses the experiences of everyday life as the object of God's concern and interprets life as the theater of God's activity. The sermons are personal, warm and direct at the same time that they are biblical and solidly doctrinal. They teach while they challenge and inspire.

There are lots of books of sermons on the market. Many are too much the shallow mouthing of words. This one is not. From it the reader can receive food for his soul and, if he is a preacher, a goal and inspiration for his own preaching.

SIDNEY A. RAND

Great Preaching Today. Edited by Alton M. Motter. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955. 255 pages. $3.

As a young minister in a rural Ohio parish more than twenty years ago, I used to hurry home on Sundays after the evening service, turn on the radio and tune in the Chicago Sunday Evening Club broadcast. The Sunday Evening Club is an institution in Chi-

cago, and has for many years attracted to its platform outstanding preachers of Protestantism.

Since this collection of sermons and addresses skims the cream from the top of the Protestant milk bottle, it can hardly be considered a "cross-section" of present day American preaching, but it does bring within the covers of one book a judicious sampling of most of the best known American preachers. As might be expected New York is well represented by Buttrick, Fosdick, McCracken, Niebuhr, Pike, Scherer and Sockman. The distinguished company includes a host of other names, all well known in Protestant circles. Three laymen (not two as the jacket says) are also included: Ralph Bunche, Elton Trueblood, and Judge Luther Youngdahl. Two Lutherans are contributors.

Reflecting the somewhat informal Sunday evening setting in Orchestra Hall, many of the sermons strike an informal and popular note. Most of them dispense with a text, or keep it well hidden. The choice of subject ranges from the theological, "The Search for God" to the human quest for the New World wherein dwelleth peace, freedom, liberty, literacy and justice for all. Two passages deal with "Christianity and Health" and "How to Handle a Sense of Guilt" in a manner that would be acceptable to those who are critical of the "Power of Positive Thinking" School. Chief emphasis, as might be expected, is on the ethical-devotional type of message.

The book would be of value in a homiletics course in a Lutheran seminary to show what other Protestants are thinking and saying. It might very well send a discerning student off to further study of the published works of the preachers and theologians represented here. One might question whether the book really deserves the publisher's claim "Great Preaching Today," though there is no question about the quality.

Editor is Alton Motter who was executive director of the Chicago Sunday Evening Club for several years, editor of "The Pulpit" and is now co-pastor of Messiah Lutheran Church in Denver.

JOHN F. RILLING

On Being Your Best. By G. Curtis Jones. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950. xvi, 129 pages.

Is there a literary style peculiar to radio addresses? Must the tone, diction, sentence structure, even the progress of thought, be different from the typical pulpit discourse? How much of the speaker's personality registers with his unseen and unseeing audience, and can one read such messages in print with appreciation of what made them effective over the radio? These are questions which have bothered some of us who have done a bit of broadcasting and writing ourselves. These are questions which were in your reviewer's mind as he read this collection of radio addresses.

One thing is immediately obvious: the limitation of time which can be enforced much more stringently upon radio preachers compels the speaker to eliminate every expendable word and cultivate a directness of thought and expression which would improve most pulpit sermons. Mr. Jones has the gift of succinct and pithy statement of his message. His sentences march straight forward with sturdy stride. You have the feeling that you are going somewhere and you want to keep on going to the end. Yet you do not find choppy phrases or a pogo-stick progress of content.

The value of apt illustrations becomes more and more impressive as you continue reading—or listening. Ideas and ideals become flesh and blood because they are presented in terms of life-situations and actual experiences, for the most part quite well selected. Sublime spiritual truths are couched in vivid every-day language without losing the sanctity of the eternal verities which the speaker seeks to communicate to the hearer. Those of us who have been trying to avoid technical terminology in stating profound Christian doctrine will find it helpful to study these addresses.

Since Mr. Jones originally delivered these messages in a series of brief broadcasts on Saturday evenings, he deliberately avoided making them sound like capsulated sermons. Instead of a Scripture text he quoted some choice bit of poetry or some epigram in prose as his springboard. Invariably he wove

into each talk a pertinent passage from the Bible which took on a fresh relevance to life because of the context. I submit that there are advantages in that procedure, particularly in radio preaching.

Fortunately, these well-polished gems are not merely decorative and diverting: they have an earnest purpose throughout that seeks what every good preacher seeks, to convert people and help them be what they know God has in mind for them. Thank God, this series does not undertake to provide the hearer with setting-up exercises to strengthen personality muscles so that he can be happier or more successful in life; it seeks the glory of God as all sound preaching does, not the gratification of man.

Occasionally the speaker indulges in colorful phrases which some will enjoy and others resent as too contrived. "The pages of history are stippled with those who have been stuck with themselves" (49). "The hope chest of service is but a rat's nest of selfishness" (53). Generally these brief talks are packed with pungent phrases that put across the point.

Among the twenty-seven topics in this series are such intriguing titles as "Locked Out," "Offside," "Stuck With Yourself," "Fed Up," and "On Your Toes." The emotions are stirred without forfeiting intellectual respectability and the reader or hearer feels impelled to put into practice this way of life our Lord expects of his followers because he makes it possible.

A famous Detroit preacher, Dr. Edgar DeWitt Jones, himself a renowned author, provides a foreword to this book of his former colleague at Central Woodward Christian Church.

HAROLD L. YOCHUM

Who Shall Be God. By Alvin N. Rogness. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1954. 183 pages. $2.50.

Twenty-five brief but pregnant sermons comprise this volume by the well known president of Luther Theological Seminary. Arranged according to the Church Year, the sermons include some intriguing titles: The Hunter God, You Cannot Be a Happy Animal, Under the Big Tent.

For the most part these sermons are refreshingly direct and bring the Gospel to bear upon live options in the minds and lives of the people. There is a very healthy emphasis upon God, an emphasis, strangely enough, so often lacking in published sermons: God as a "hunter," the inescapable God, God's "fairness," God's judgment, God's "incredible" love. This positive emphasis is most welcome. It is unfortunate, however, that the brevity of treatment does not always permit the author to do justice to the size of his themes.

Each sermon is suggested by a text but for this reviewer's taste too few of them provide an exposition of the text. The treatment on the whole is textual-topical. The text suggests the theme. The theme is developed clearly and often incisively. But only occasionally do these good sermons throw light on the biblical passage from which the themes are derived. In a time of widespread biblical illiteracy when from every corner comes the appeal for more expository preaching it is unfortunate that so few published sermons respond to this appeal.

Dr. Rogness' style is a mixture. At times he is almost daringly fresh: "Would we want a God who is a sleepy, old dullard, and who with a couple of beers under his belt chuckles and thinks it cute when Cain kills Abel. . . ." At other times the style reverts to biblical and theological terminology which could be meaningful for only a rare few in the congregation: "You see the Holy Spirit sent to finish in you the work which began at creation, was interrupted by the fall, was restored in the redemption of Christ, and which he intends to complete in glory." The sermons rely chiefly upon the author's imagination and directness rather than upon anecdotes and quotations for contemporary relevance. This is a welcome change from much published sermon material in recent years.

The sermons are commended to pastors for their directness, fresh insights and intriguing themes which may well start a man's own thoughts unwinding.

EDMUND A. STEIMLE

Go Preach! Edited by Theodore D. Wedel and George W. R. McCray. Seabury Press, 1954. 242 pages. $3.50.

The subtitle of this volume states that it contains "thirty sermons for the laity." By "the laity," the reader soon discovers, is meant lay readers. The Protestant Episcopal Church has long provided lay leadership for many otherwise shepherdless congregations. Now the effort is made to place in the hands of these lay readers sermons prepared by the ordained clergy to be read at services of public worship. A foreword by Bishop Henry Knox Sherrill explains that the thirty sermons of this volume have been selected from hundreds of sermons provided for 2,500 lay readers under the direction of a Committee on Laymen's Work.

This background contributes to the readers' understanding of the work. The sermons have been prepared by well-known preachers and represent a good cross section of the ministry of the Church. Bishops and priests from the United States, Canada and New Zealand have collaborated in the undertaking. Such well-known names as E. Frank Salmon, James A. Pike, W. Russell Bowie, Frank D. Gifford, Hamilton H. Kellogg appear upon the title pages, thus assuring good content.

The book is divided into two parts, the first being Sermons on The Church Year, and the second on Great Themes. In all of the sermons it is apparent that the authors have kept their assigned objectives in view. They have written as though they were aware that the sermons were to be preached by others than themselves. Their messages are faithful to the theme of the Christian Gospel. They are developed clearly and for the most part have "the virtue of a straight line." In content and composition, they present a worthy example of evangelical preaching. One may question whether any man can satisfactorily preach another man's sermon. But granted the desirability or the necessity of a lay readership, these sermons can implement it effectively. They have much to commend them, and ought to make a valuable contribution to the proclamation of the good news.

HARRY F. BAUGHMAN

Dead or Alive. A Series of Sermons for Lent and Easter. By Herbert Lindemann. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955. 120 pages. $1.50.

Written by a Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod pastor, whose parish is in Fort Wayne, Indiana, these sermons for Lent and Easter have found sympathetic review in the Foreword provided by Dr. O. P. Kretzmann. As he puts it, they "reflect a sensitive awareness of the burden and glory of preaching. There is evidence of hard work. . . . These sermons are sound, thoughtful, and relevant."

With these statements the present reviewer finds himself in full agreement. This pastor speaks to people where they sit and points to the Christ where he stands. He knows the world and the Word and brings them together in forceful fashion. But he does not let the individual escape in the process and the careful reader finds both thought and language directly aimed and hitting the mark of his own life and conscience page upon page—and not too comfortably at that.

Of formal or extended illustrations to be excised, there are not many. Such as there are are well interwoven and really "belong." The texts are in the wording of the Revised Standard Version or of J. B. Phillips' "Letters to Young Churches" and are basic to their respective sermons. Of the two series, higher rank seems to me to belong to the series for Lent ("Dangerous Distractions") but this may be because the third sermon of the Easter Series ("The Risen Life") stands out as labored and failing to carry conviction with it.

Concordia has done well to issue the volume in heavy paper covers, fully serving their purpose but keeping the cost down. Even were this not the case, the book represents a sound investment for any pastor as he prepares his soul for his Lenten labors.

HENRY H. BAGGER

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY